

UNCLASSIFIED

PD-AAU-815
50617

**AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT**



ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

FY 82

INDIA

JUNE 1980

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

UNCLASSIFIED

INDIA
FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Table I - Long Range Plan and Narrative	1 - 6
2. Table IV - Project Budget Data	7 - 9
3. Decision Package Narrative:	10 - 16
A. Minimum	
B. Current	
C. AAPL	
4. Table V - Proposed Program Ranking	17 - 20
5. Workforce and Operating Expenses:	
A. Table VI - Project Summary	21
B. Table VII - Operating Expense Funded Personnel	22 - 23
C. Table VIII - Operating Expense Summary	24 - 25
D. Table VIII A - AAG/IIS Operating Expense Summary	26 - 27
E. Table IX - Position Requirements	28 - 32
F. Automatic Data Processing (ADP)/Word Processing (WP) Narrative and Table VIII-B.	33 - 35
6. Table X - Special Concerns	36 - 40
7. PL-480	41
A. Narrative	42 - 66
B. Table XI - PL-480 Title I/III Requirements	67
C. Table XII - PL-480 Title I/III Supply and Distribution	68
D. Table XIII - PL-480 Title II Statistical Tables	69 - 74
E. PL-480 Program Ranking and Composition Table - Titles I, II	75 - 78
8. Third Country Training in India	
A. Status of Special Foreign Currency Appropriations for Nepalese Training in India	79
B. Nepalese Participants Tables - FY 1980/1982	80 - 87

Decision Unit: INDIA

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE I - LONG RANGE PLAN BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT (\$ Millions)

Development Assistance	FY 1980 EST.	FY 1981 EST.	FY 1982 REQUEST			PLANNING PERIOD			
			MIN	CURR	AAPL	1983	1984	1985	1986
Agriculture, Rural Dev. & Nutrition	79.5	125.6	127.9	132.9	172.9	291.0	417.0	552.0	622.0
Grants	0.5	12.0	8.5	13.5	14.5	28.0	29.5	35.0	35.0
Loans	79.0	113.6	119.4	119.4	158.4	263.0	387.5	517.0	587.0
Population	13.8	-	6.9	11.9	18.9	40.0	54.0	65.0	84.0
Grants	13.8	-	6.9	11.9	18.9	40.0	54.0	65.0	84.0
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health	9.9	9.4	-	1.0	3.0	10.0	14.0	16.0	20.0
Grants	9.9	9.4	-	1.0	3.0	10.0	14.0	16.0	20.0
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grants	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Selected Dev. Activities	-	-	-	2.2	5.2	9.0	15.0	17.0	24.0
Grants	-	-	-	2.2	5.2	9.0	10.0	12.0	14.0
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0	10.0
SUBTOTAL FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNTS AND TOTAL DA ACCOUNTS	103.2	135.0	134.8	148.0	200.0	350.0	500.0	650.0	750.0
Grants	24.2	21.4	15.4	28.6	41.6	87.0	107.5	128.0	153.0
Loans	79.0	113.6	119.4	119.4	158.4	263.0	392.5	522.0	597.0
(NON-ADD)									
PL 480:									
Title I	-	-	-	-	40.0	60.0	60.0	80.0	80.0
(of which Title III)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Title II	133.5	158.5	148.4	162.6	162.6	168.0	184.0	203.0	223.0
- PVOs.	106.9	134.0	125.7	139.9	139.9	154.0	169.0	186.0	205.0
- Coops.	26.6	24.5	22.7	22.7	22.7	14.0	15.0	17.0	18.0
Regional Programs - OPGs:	0.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.2
Special Foreign Currency Appropriation(SFCA): a/									
Grants(Health)	20.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operating Expense(MOB):	1.9	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9
TOTAL PERSONNEL:(Nos.)	63	79	81	81	83	86	88	91	95
Mission - U.S. DH	19	21	22	22	23	24	25	26	28
- F.N. DH	39b/	53	54	54	55	57	58	60	62
- DH/PIT	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

a/ Excludes SFCA costs of Third Country Training in India in support of USAID/Nepal

b/ Excludes 9 approved but frozen FY 80 positions.

TABLE I NARRATIVE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROPOSED PROGRAM
AND USAID STAFFING

Part I. Relationship Between FY '82 AAPL and Personnel
Planning Level

In FY 1977 USAID India managed a \$143 million PL 480 program, including a Title II voluntary agency program of \$117 million and a \$26 million Title I loan; implemented a sizeable third country training program in India; and managed a portfolio of Cooley loans and other residual local currency grants. A direct hire staff of 45, six Americans and 39 foreign national employees, managed this program.

In FY 1980 USAID/India is managing a Development Assistance program with a \$103.2 million OYB and a \$149 million pipeline, a \$133.5 million PL 480 Title II voluntary agency program, and the other activities mentioned above except Title I. A staff of 67 full time and five part time employees is authorized by AID/W to administer this program; 19 Americans and 48 foreign national full time employees, and five part time employees.

For FY 1982, USAID is proposing a \$402.6 million program consisting of \$200 million in Development Assistance (and a pipeline of \$187.5 million not included in the above figure), a \$162.6 million PL 480 Title II voluntary agency program, and a \$40 million Title I loan. The Cooley loan program will have largely terminated with the exception of the most intractable problem cases; a larger third country training program than present will be carried out in India; and a number of local currency-financed activities will continue.

USAID/India proposes 23 Americans and 55 foreign national, full time employees, a 78 person direct hire staff plus five part time employees, to administer this program. The Position Ceiling Planning Level assigned to this Mission is 68, one more person than USAID's FY 1980 position authorization.

We believe that USAID/India already is one of the most "efficient" A. I. D. missions when defined in terms of direct hire personnel in relation to program. This has been possible because

of USAID's program philosophy and style, the capability of the well-established Indian institutions with which we deal, and the high quality of Indian senior and middle level manpower, both technical and administrative.

USAID deliberately has focused our portfolio to emphasize two major program objectives with a small number of key sub-sectors and projects which can have a significant impact on development and the rural poor. Most of these projects are designed to be implemented entirely by the GOI through Indian institutions. We see USAID's heaviest involvement coming during the project design stage and during periodic, carefully scheduled and staffed evaluations. A small but highly qualified group of technical generalists is required to carry out routine monitoring with the help of our very competent foreign national staff, and to manage the design and evaluation process using specialized technical skills of both American and host country contract personnel.

Two exceptions to the management style mentioned above are the PL 480 Title II program managed on the ground by five American PVOs and cooperative organizations, and the proposed FAA Title XII Agricultural Research and social forestry projects which will have American university personnel intimately involved. However, these projects will require USAID direct-hire monitoring by qualified technical generalists nonetheless.

USAID is requesting only two additional American and five foreign national positions in FY 1981 to help manage our rapidly expanding program. Both Americans and one Indian professional will join the Office of Agricultural and Rural Development which has the lion's share of project responsibility in the Mission. An American agricultural research officer and Indian assistant will take over the project management of a major Title XII Agricultural Research Project from a contract design specialist. A second American project manager will help to monitor the growing portfolio of agricultural projects. An Indian health professional, a Food for Peace monitoring officer to help follow A.I.D.'s largest Title II program, and two support personnel will round out this modest FY 1981 increment.

A strong technical generalist group must be backed properly by a strong supporting staff of program and loan officers, management and controller personnel. For FY 1982, USAID requests two additional officers as basic workforce members of the Minimum Decision Package. These are an American assistant evaluation officer to help coordinate our maturing portfolio, and an Indian accountant needed for the same expanded portfolio.

An American natural resources project officer and one Indian support person are added to the AAPL Package to manage the Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh social forestry projects, replacing a contract design specialist.

USAID is planning three new projects in FY 1981, each of which is expected to contain a substantial technical transfer, especially but not exclusively in the design process. In lieu of these staff-intensive agricultural research, nutrition and social forestry projects, A. I. D. could propose additional funding for three institution based agricultural programs, agricultural development credit, and fertilizer promotion. These are strong Indian programs oriented toward the rural poor, which can absorb considerably increased financial flows. USAID could then probably remain within the Position Ceiling Planning Level assigned to this Mission. However, the technology transfer element in USAID's program would be all but eliminated, and USAID's portfolio would retain only a limited selection.

The FY 1982 AAPL Package could be treated similarly. Agricultural Credit and Fertilizer Promotion can easily absorb a higher level of resources, leaving out technology transfer projects such as Agricultural Research, Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition, and Maharashtra Social Forestry.

Part II. Relationship Between Out Year Program and Personnel Staffing

The India Development Assistance program is projected to increase from \$200 million in FY 1982 to \$750 million in FY 1986. Nonetheless, we believe that the numbers of additional direct hire staff will be in the range of only 10 to 20 depending upon the number

of technology transfer projects involved. More than half of these would be Indian professionals to assist in the monitoring of the additional projects in the portfolio.

As discussed in Part I, USAID management philosophy is to have a small group of respected technical generalists with professional Indian assistants manage the design, implementation and evaluation process. We will use specialized contract teams to assist the GOI Institutions concerned in the design and evaluation stages, relying upon the Indian institutions for implementation with monitoring from USAID's direct hire staff in most cases.

India has a number of strong credit institutions with programs designed to reach the rural poor and the determination to do so. The GOI also has developed central monitoring institutions to provide oversight and evaluation of state implementing organizations. USAID, for example, is beginning work on our third medium irrigation loan to a third Indian state irrigation department. In this process we have learned that we can count with confidence upon the GOI's Central Water Commission and its professional monitoring staff to assure that state programs are carefully implemented.

In addition to central level technical monitoring organizations, the GOI's Planning Commission has developed a strong Program Evaluation Organization which in turn is helping the states to organize evaluation cells. The Government has sponsored strong research organizations in most sectors as well.

USAID has had good success in contracting with private Indian consulting firms for social soundness analyses and environmental assessments. We are confident that USAID can contract for much of the required applied research and analysis we require in those cases where it is not done directly by government organizations. It is the specialized skills that USAID require from AID/W and/or American intermediaries. Skilled direct hire technical generalists are needed to draw upon the available mix of organizations for AID's monitoring purposes.

USAID/India believes that the India bilateral program already is being managed along the lines commended to the Agency for the eighties. We are managing one of the largest A.I.D. programs with a small staff and will require only modest increments to manage the anticipated quantum increase.

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

DECISION UNIT

386 - INDIA

PROJECT			OBLIGATION DATE (FY)		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED NON-ROUTINE EVAL.	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										FY 1982 APL OBLIG.	FORWARD FUNDED TO (MO/YR)	FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS FY 1983 & Beyond
						CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/79	FY 1980			FY 1981			CUM PIPELINE					
							OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM PIPELINE	OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM PIPELINE						
NUMBER	TITLE	O/L	INITIAL	FINAL														
	<u>Agricultural, Rural Dev. & Nutrition (FN)</u>					109,088	79,500	28,000	160,588	125,600	128,000	158,188	172,900			31,000		
0466	Agricultural Dev. Credit	L	80	82*	1/82	-	20,000	0	20,000	35,600	55,600	-	44,400	6/82	-			
0467	Rajasthan Medium Irrigation	L	80	81	2/82	-	15,000	0	15,000	20,000	4,000	31,000	-	6/86	-			
		G	80	80	2/82	-	500	0	500	-	100	400	-	6/84	-			
0470	Ag. Research	G	81	84	12/83	-	-	-	-	7,000	300	6,700	-	9/85	13,000			
0471	Fertilizer Promotion	L	79	82*	12/81	22,000	44,000	22,000	44,000	50,000	44,000	50,000	34,000	6/83	-			
0475	Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry	L	81	82	1/84	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	8,000	16,000	8/86	-			
		G	81	81	1/84	-	-	-	-	1,000	-	1,000	-	8/86	-			
0476	Integ. Maternal/Child Nutrition	G	81	84	9/83	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	4,000	8,000	9/84	3,000			
0477	Karnataka Medium Irrigation	L	82	82	12/84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	6/87	-			
		G	82	82	12/84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500	6/87	-			
0478	Maharashtra Social Forestry	L	82	82	1/85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24,000	8/87	-			
		G	82	82	1/85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	8/87	-			
0479	Land & Water Conservation (Small Tanks)	G	82	82	6/83	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	6/85	-			
		L	85	85	9/83	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000		
	Pipeline Projects:	L	-	-		87,088	-	6,000	81,088	-	24,000	57,088	-					
	0462, Rural Electrification	L	79	79	a/	(58,000)	-	(-)	(58,000)	-	(17,000)	(41,000)	-	6/83	-			
	0464, Gujarat Medium Irrigation	L	78	78	12/80	(29,088)	-	(6,000)	(23,088)	-	(7,000)	(16,088)	-	6/83	-			
a/ Under Central AID/W financing two coordinated evaluations will examine in FY 80/81 various socio-economic aspects of rural electrification in India. USAID will assess the need for a special project evaluation when the results of these studies are available.																		
* Change from CP																		

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

DECISION UNIT

386 INDIA

PROJECT			OBLIGATION DATE (FY)		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED NON- ROUTINE EVAL.	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										FORWARD FUNDED TO (MO/YR)	FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS FY 1983 & Beyond
						CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/79	FY 1980			FY 1981			FY 1982 APL OBLIG.				
							OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM PIPELINE	OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM PIPELINE					
NUMBER	TITLE	O/L	INITIAL	FINAL													
0468 0489	Population (PN)					1,500	13,800	1,500	13,800	-	3,000	10,800	18,900		28,000		
	Integ. Rural Health/Pop. Female Village Volunteer Project	G	80	82	5/83	-	13,800	-	13,800	-	3,000	10,800	6,900	9/85	-		
		G	82	85	4/84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,000	12/83	28,000		
	Pipeline Project: 0455, Malaria Control	L				1,500	-	1,500	-	-	-	-	-		-		
		L	78	79*	-	(1,500)	-	(1,500)	-	-	-	-	-	9/81	-		
0468 0480	Health (HE)					36,500	19,900	25,500	20,900	9,400	13,000	17,300	3,000		7,000		
	Integ. Rural Health/Pop. Female Village Volunteer Project	G	80	82	5/83	-	9,900	-	9,900	9,400	2,000	17,300	-	9/85	-		
		G	82	85	4/84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	12/83	7,000		
	Pipeline Project: 0455, Malaria Control	L				36,500	-	25,500	11,000	-	11,000	-	-		-		
		L	78	79*	-	(36,500)	-	(25,500)	(11,000)	-	(11,000)	-	-	9/81	-		
0474	Selected Development Activities (SD)					2,000	-	200	1,800	-	600	1,200	5,200		-		
	Alternative Energy Res. Dev.	G	82	82	3/84	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,200	9/85	-		
	Pipeline Project: 0465, Technologies for Rural Poor	G				2,000	-	200	1,800	-	600	1,200	-		-		
		G	78	78*	12/81	(2,000)	-	(200)	(1,800)	-	(600)	(1,200)	-	9/83	-		
	TOTAL FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNTS & TOTAL DA:					149,088	103,200	55,200	197,088	135,000	144,600	187,488	200,000		66,000		
* Change from CP																	

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

DECSION UNIT

386 INDIA

PROJECT			OBLIGATION DATE (FY)		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED MAINT. ROUTINE EVAL.	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)									FY 1982 APPL OBLIG.	FORWARD FUNDED TO (MO/YR)	FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS FY 1983 & Beyond
						CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/79	FY 1980			FY 1981							
							OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM. PIPELINE	OBLIG.	EXPEND.	CUM. PIPELINE					
NUMBER	TITLE	G/L	INITIAL	FINAL													
	Regional Programs:																
	Operational Program Grants (OPGs)(Project No. 498-0251)																
	Coop. Oilseed Processing Mgt. Dev. (CLUSA/NCDC)	G	78	78	9/80	448	-	215	233	-	233	-	-	8/81			
	Program Development Support (CLUSA/INDIA)	G	79	79	9/80	204	-	60	144	-	64	80	-	12/81	-		
	Oilseed Growers' Coop. Project (CLUSA/NDDDB)	G	79	79	9/80	375	-	102	273	-	161	112	-	8/82	-		
	Composite Program for Women and Preschoolers (CARE/INDIA)	G	80	80	-	-	63	43	20	-	20	-	-	3/81	-		
	New OPGs	G	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	800	200	600	800		-		
	Special Foreign Currency Appropriations (SFCA)																
	386-0406 St. John Medical College & Hospital	G	78	78	-	8,950	-	900	8,050	-	900	7,150	-	4/86	-		
	386-0469 Private Institutions Rural Health Support	G	80	80	3/82	-	20,000	-	20,000	-	3,000	17,000	-	9/83	-		

6

DECISION PACKAGE NARRATIVEIntroduction

This Mission presented the case for a significant development assistance program for India in January's FY 1982 Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) in which we noted that India accounts for more than half of the poor in AID-assisted developing countries, with its population of over 650 million and its per capita of under \$200. However, India's importance is not only measured in numbers of poor people or of total population. Rather it should be viewed in terms of the size of its economy, its devotion to democracy and its commitment to development in the context of equitable growth.

We summarized our CDSS program recommendations as follows:

USAID proposes to allocate the major portion of its program over the period to promote expansion of food production and rural employment (irrigation, small farmer credit, fertilizer supply, agricultural research, cooperative development and rural works). Second priority is accorded to programs to improve health and family welfare (rural health systems, family planning efforts and food for maternal and child health centers). USAID also proposes to address certain special concerns such as expanding access to primary education through school feeding and developing new approaches to improving the status of women, conserving India's natural resource base, and enhancing energy supplies.

Washington's response to USAID following the Interagency review was that: "AID/W commends the Mission for the high quality of its efforts. AID/W approves the strategy subject to the issues/concerns expressed below. A new self-contained FY 1983 CDSS will not be required." AID/W guidance continued that "A decision also was reached, in light of the GOI's currently sound development policies and good absorptive capacity, to give high priority to increases above the current program levels." (Reference: State 086471 dated 2 April 1980.)

USAID's proposed program for FY 1982 accordingly has been developed along the lines of our approved strategy as articulated in our CDSS. Our budget proposal has been reduced slightly to the Approved Assistance Planning Level for India of \$200 million in Development Assistance. USAID's complete proposal for FY 1982 is for a program estimated at \$402.6 million, the components of which are: \$200 million of Development Assistance, a Title II voluntary agency program estimated at \$162.6 million and a PL-480 Title I vegetable oil loan of \$40 million.

DECISION PACKAGE - MINIMUM

USAID's minimum package proposal for FY 1982 amounts to \$283.2 million, a decrease of \$10 million from our proposed FY 1981 program. (The real decrease is greater but is masked by increased PL-480 commodity prices.) The Mission believes that U.S. Development and PL-480 Assistance in FY 1982 should be roughly as large as that proposed for FY 1981 if we are to remain credible in our assertions that the United States wants to continue to assist our sister democracy in its development aspirations. In FY 1980, the third year of resumed U.S. bilateral assistance, U.S. aid commitments are only marginally larger than the first year in nominal terms, and actually decreased if inflation is taken into account. The proposed increase to \$294 million in FY 1981 is an improvement but a marginal increase in real terms. The FY 1982 Minimum Decision Package unfortunately will not even sustain the FY 1981 level.

The Minimum Package provides for no growth in the Development Assistance program levels and permits only one new project to be started. The remainder of Development Assistance funds will be used to complete funding for USAID's on-going project portfolio, with the exception of the high priority Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition project. This project which will continue to require funding in future years is being designed to complement Title II Maternal Child Health Programs. It will target directly the problem of infant and young child malnutrition and mortality.

Title II activities included in the Minimum Decision Package are continued at the same recipient and commodity levels with emphasis on qualitative improvement. The Title II programs which are less

directly related to the CDSS strategy have been excluded from the Minimum Decision Package. However they are highly visible and well regarded programs whose abrupt termination could have adverse consequences.

Activities totalling \$155.8 million or 55% of the Minimum Decision Package address our first CDSS objective to increase food supply and rural employment. This increases to \$171.8 million or 61% of the Package if the closely related "special concerns" project, Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry, is included. These funds permit one new start, Karnataka Medium Irrigation, in the subsector which is perhaps USAID's single greatest area of concentration; irrigation projects combine immediate and future employment opportunities with one of the major inputs required for increased agricultural production. The Package also includes funds to complete the financing currently contemplated for the Agricultural Development Credit and Fertilizer Promotion projects. Title II activities addressing this CDSS objectives are the CLUSA-supported Cooperative Oilseeds Development program and private-sector Food For Work programs supported by CRS and LWR/CWS.

Implementation of several significant but fully-funded projects addressing the food supply and rural employment objective also will continue. The two Medium Irrigation projects in Gujarat and Rajasthan, and the ground water-oriented Rural Electrification project will continue; Agricultural Research activities will be getting underway.

USAID's second major CDSS objective is fertility and mortality reduction. If held to the Minimum Package level, USAID will continue to fund two important projects addressing this objective, Integrated Rural Health/Population, and Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition. As mentioned above, the latter project is being designed to complement CARE's Title II support for the GOI's Special Nutrition Program and to help directly target the necessary resources to the nutritionally neediest group, infants and very young children, and pregnant and lactating mothers. Implementation also will continue on the special foreign currency projects supporting private sector health groups and institutions. Unfortunately, the Minimum Package level will not permit new starts under this important CDSS objective.

Two special AID concerns mentioned in the CDSS are included in the Minimum Decision Package. USAID expects to complete financing of the Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry project, an

activity combining conservation, energy and employment concerns. USAID also endorses the continuation of CARE's Title II support for State school feeding programs which are an inducement to school attendance in rural areas by Scheduled Castes and Tribes. These are the groups targeted by the programs and those with the lowest records of school attendance. CRS-supported rural school feeding programs also are included in this Decision Package. Applied energy research activities will continue under the fully-funded Technologies for the Rural Poor project but USAID cannot recommend additional initiatives under the constraints of the Minimum Package.

We have included the entire USAID staff in the required minimum FY 1982 staff with the exception only of the two new positions requested in the Minimum Decision Package. Only one new project is requested in this package. The workload we project for project design in the Current/AAPL Decision Packages, will be fully utilized in normal monitoring and termination plans. Although PL-480 Title II funds will be disbursed to American suppliers, major food shipments would continue.

The two additional positions requested as part of the basic work force are for program and controller support to project managers, as described in the Table I narrative.

DECISION PACKAGE-CURRENT

USAID recommends a Current Package program of \$148 million in Development Assistance and \$162.6 in PL-480 Title II commodities for a total Package of \$310.6 million. The Development Assistance increase of \$13.2 million will permit USAID to initiate three new projects, one of which has potential for a major impact on fertility and mortality reduction. The other two projects are exciting model activities which could lead to significant innovation in the medium term.

PL-480 dollar levels are deceptive. Our FY 1982 Current Package request of \$162.6 million based on USDA- provided prices will simply allow the participating voluntary agencies to continue their programs at the same recipient and commodity levels as in FY 1980, but at an additional cost of \$29.1 million. This increase will occur despite a number of economy steps which USAID has

agreed upon with the PVOs. Had they continued their FY 1980 mix of commodities and shipping practices, our FY 1982 request would have been \$11.5 million higher.

The three new Development Assistance project proposals include a Land and Water Conservation (Small Tanks) project in which Indian PVOs in cooperation with the Indian agricultural services will be working with villagers in the minor watersheds of Western India to provide an enhanced livelihood through development and conservation of neglected hill areas. USAID will support the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare in the addition of a Female Village Volunteer component to the community outreach program which USAID is supporting with our FY 1980 project. This new element will be even more closely linked to our objective of fertility reduction. Finally we will be able to follow up on current energy initiatives just getting underway in the Technologies for the Rural Poor project through a new Alternative Energy Resources Development project.

The Title II Current Package level will permit a continuation of important programs which cannot be sustained at the Minimum Package level. The MCH Pre-school feeding program is a very low cost program in that it is piggy-backed on regular school feeding programs in rural areas; it operates in some of the poorest areas in the country. Since it is not a targeted nutrition program, USAID considers this to be more appropriately considered as a school familiarization program for pre-schoolers and a further incentive to remain in school for their older siblings. These assumptions will be incorporated and tested in the proposed School Feeding evaluation which USAID is discussing with CARE and the GOI.

The Current Package level also will permit CRS to continue its three school feeding programs in the public schools of Baroda, Delhi and Madras. These urban poor programs are meeting a major social need. Two other CRS programs targetted for both urban and rural poor also would continue. These programs include support to the work of Mother Theresa's Missionaries of Charity and similar programs.

Approval of the Current Decision Package will signal to the Government of India that the United States continues to want to show a steady if small increase in the Development Assistance program while maintaining our traditional interest and support through Title II Food for quantitatively steady and qualitatively improving programs.

DECISION PACKAGE - AAPL

The Mission strongly recommends that the full \$402.6 million AAPL Decision Assistance Package Level for India be endorsed. The \$200 million Approved Assistance Planning Level for the Development Assistance Program together with a PL-480 Title II program of \$162.6 million and a Title I loan of \$40 million will make up a total economic assistance package of \$402.6 million. This program will not only meet A.I.D.'s mandate concerns and address significant objectives of India's own development plans, but also will show the intention of the United States to increase support for a major developing country and sister democracy at a time when inflation and increasing import costs, especially for petroleum products, are expected to cause a major drop in India's foreign exchange reserves.

USAID proposes one major new project, Maharashtra Social Forestry, which will introduce into a new State our experiences in working with Madhya Pradesh in this significant area which combines alternative energy production, employment and conservation. The two new positions associated with this priority ranking also will assist with the ongoing social forestry and related conservation projects.

The AAPL level for Development Assistance will provide optimum funding for USAID's new project initiatives in FY 1982. The Mission would strongly prefer to fully finance the Karnataka Medium Irrigation Project in FY 1982 rather than mortgage future program levels to the project. Although it is Agency policy to fully finance loans, there simply was insufficient room in the Minimum / Current Packages to follow this highly desirable policy.

The proposed increases for the Female Village Volunteer Project and the Alternative Energy Resources Development Project represent different kinds of opportunities. Both projects would have enhanced levels of activity at the AAPL Decision Package level. The Female Village Volunteer program would get off to a faster and broader start.

Funds are included in this package for the Alternative Energy Resources Development Project to permit an FY 1982 start on pilot projects for integrated rural energy systems.

The Mission has examined the question of a PL-480 Title I program in response to long standing GOI interest. The most recent request was made at the March 1980 meeting of the Indo-U.S. Joint Economic and Commercial Sub-Commission. We have concluded that an FY 1982 \$40 million loan for the import of soybean oil is important in view both of India's requirement for increased imports of vegetable oils and because of increasing pressure on India's balance of payments. A full discussion of this request is contained in the PL-480 section of this ABS.

USAID is not requesting an increase in recipient or tonnage levels for Title II programs in FY 1982 despite requests for increases from some of the voluntary agencies. It is USAID's opinion that this is the time for qualitative improvement and we expect to make major gains over the next two to three years. The GOI and CARE will use funds to be provided in USAID's proposed FY 1981 Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition project to effect qualitative improvements, especially, more precise targetting of resources on those most at risk, either potentially or presently. A major school feeding evaluation over the next two years will help us to test our assumptions and justifications for this program. USAID considers it very important that U.S. support for Title II programs continue at 1980 commodity and recipient levels while significant modifications to the Maternal/Child Health programs are under discussion and a long term evaluation of the school feeding programs is in process.

This Mission reiterates its recommendation for Washington approval of the USAID request for a total, integrated program package of \$402.6 million. Other than a negligible amount of support for military training and excess currency programs which transfer no real resources, this is the total bilateral assistance offered to India by the U.S. Government. This is a modest proposal when measured against the importance of India as a working democracy and regional power, and as the home for half of the total number of poor people in A.I.D. - assisted countries.

TABLE V - FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING					Bureau Code: 386		Decision Code: INDIA			
RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	PIPELINE/ ONGOING/ NEW	LOAN/ GRANT	APPROP. ACGT.	DECISION UNIT PROGRAM FUNDING (\$000)		WORKFORCE (Number of Positions)			
					INCR	CUM	USDH		FNDH	
							INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM
	DECISION PACKAGE - MINIMUM									
	Pipeline Projects									
	0462 Rural Electrification	P	L	FN	(41,000)	(41,000)				
	0464 Gujarat Medium Irrigation	P	L	FN	(16,088)	(57,088)				
	0465 Technologies for Rural Poor	P	G	SD	(1,200)	(58,288)				
	0467 Rajasthan Medium Irrigation	P	L	FN	(31,000)	(89,288)				
		P	G	FN	(400)	(89,688)				
	0470 Agricultural Research	P	G	FN	(6,700)	(96,388)				
	(LC Projects - Special Foreign)						
	(Currency Appropriations)						
	((SFCA Grants):)						
	(St. John Medical College (O) \$13,650 (FY 78))						
	(Private Inst. Rural Health (O) \$20,000 FY 80))						
	Sub Total (Non-Add):					(96,388)	21	21	58	58 ^{a/}
	New and Continuing Projects									
1.	0477 Karnataka Medium Irrigation	(N	L	FN	25,000	25,000				
		(N	G	FN	500	25,500				
2.	0466 Ag. Development Credit	O	L	FN	44,400	69,900				
3.	0471 Fertilizer Promotion	O	L	FN	34,000	103,900				
4.	PL -480 Title II MCH Public-Food with additional inputs				(19,111)					
	^{a/} Personnel Planning Level is 68. Included in this package are 74 full time and 5 part time positions.									
	MCH = Maternal/Child Health									

TABLE V - FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING					Bureau Code: 386 Decision Code: INDIA					
RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	PIPELINE/ ONGOING/ NEW	LOAN/ GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	PROGRAM FUNDING (\$000)		WORKFORCE (Number of Positions)			
					INCR	CUM	USDH		FNDH	
							INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM
	Decision Package - Minimum (contd.)									
5.	PL-480 Title II - MCH Private				(13,846)					
6.	PL-480 Title II MCH Public - Food alone				(14,726)					
7.	0476 Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition	O	G	FN	8,000	111,900				
8.	0468 Integrated Rural Health/Pop	O	G	PN	6,900	118,800				
9.	PL-480 Title II - AG Oilseeds Coop. Dev.				(22,743)					
10.	PL-480 Title II - SF Rural Public				(44,210)					
11.	PL-480 Title II - SF Rural Private				(4,616)					
12.	PL-480 Title II - Food for Work, Rural Private				(29,141)	(148,393)				
13.	0475 Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry	O	L	FN	16,000	134,800				
	{ LC Projects - Special Foreign									
	{ Currency Appropriation (SFCA Grants):									
	{ Third Country Training in India (O) \$840 (FY 82)}									
14.	Basic Workforce:			DA		134,800				
				PL 480		(148,393)	1	22	1	59
	Total Minimum Package and Related Basic Workforce:			DA	134,800					
				PL 480	(48,393)		22		59	
	SF = School Feeding									

Bureau Code:

Decision Code:

TABLE V - FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

DECISION UNIT

386

INDIA

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	PIPELINE/ ONGOING/ NEW	LOAN/ GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	PROGRAM FUNDING (\$000)		WORKFORCE (Number of Positions)			
					INCR	CUM	USDH		FNDH	
							INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM
	<u>DECISION PACKAGE - CURRENT</u>									
15.	0479 Land & Water Conserv. (Small Tanks)	N	G	FN	5,000	139,800				
16.	0480 Female Village Volunteer Project	N	G	PN	5,000	144,800				
		N	G	HE	1,000	145,800				
17.	0474 Alternative Energy Res. Dev.	N	G	SD	2,200	148,000				
18.	PL-480 Title II - MCH Pre-School Food				(7,528)					
19.	PL-480 Title II - SF Urban Public				(772)					
20.	PL-480 Title II - Other Child Feeding- Rural & Urban Private				(3,221)					
21.	PL-480 Title II - Individual Health Cases - Urban Private				(2,676)	(162,590)				
22.	Workforce Increment Current Package:			DA PL480	-	148,000 (162,590)	-	22	-	59
	Total Current Package and Related Workforce:			DA PL480	13,200 (14,197)		-		-	
	<u>DECISION PACKAGE - AAPL</u>									
23.	0477 Karnataka Medium Irrigation	N	L	FN	15,000	163,000	-	22	-	59
24.	0478 Maharashtra Social Forestry	N	L	FN	24,000	187,000	1	23	1	60
		N	G	FN	1,000	188,000				
25.	0480 Female Village Volunteer Project	N	G	PN	7,000	195,000	-	23	-	60
		N	G	HE	2,000	197,000	-	23	-	60

Bureau Code:

Decision Code:

TABLE V - FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

DECISION UNIT

386

INDIA

PROGRAM FUNDING
(\$000)WORKFORCE
(Number of Positions)

INCR

CUM

USDH
INCR

CUM

FNDH
INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

CUM

INCR

**TABLE VI
PROJECT SUMMARY**

NUMBER OF PROJECTS

	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82 MIN	FY 82 CURR	FY 82 AAPL
IMPLEMENTATION AT BEGINNING OF YEAR.....	9	11	16	16	16	16
MOVING FROM DESIGN TO IMPLEMENTATION DURING YEAR.....	4	5	4	2	5	6
DESIGN FOR FUTURE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION.....	5	3	6	5	5	6
SUBTOTAL.....	18	19	26	23	26	28
NUMBER OF NON-PROJECT ACTIVITIES.....	18	17	17	17	17	18
TOTAL.....	36	36	43	40	43	46

**NUMBER OF PROJECTS MOVING FROM
DESIGN TO IMPLEMENTATION BY PROJECT SIZE**

AID'S CONTRIBUTION TO LIFE OF PROJECT COST

	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82 MIN	FY 82 CURR	FY 82 AAPL
LESS THAN \$1 MILLION.....	2	1	1	1	1	1
\$1 TO \$5 MILLION.....	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$5 TO \$15 MILLION.....	-	-	1	-	1	1
\$15 TO \$25 MILLION.....	-	1	2	-	1	2
MORE THAN \$25 MILLION.....	2	3	-	1	2	2

TABLE VII
OPERATING EXPENSE FUNDED PERSONNEL
YEAR END POSITIONS

22

FUNCTIONS	FY 79				FY 80				FY 81			
	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT
Executive Direction	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
Program Planning	2	3			2	3			2	4		
Project Design	2	3			3	3			3	3		
Project Implementation	3	13	1		9	19	2	2	11	29	2	2
Financial Management	1	8			1	5			1	7		
Mission Support	-	11			-	11				12		1
Non Mission Specific	-	7 a/			-	7 a/				7 a/		
TOTAL.....	10	45 b/	1	-	19	48 c/	2	2	21	62 c/	2	3
PLUS: PASAs (OE & Program)	-				-				-			
LESS: JAO Details	-	IDs			-	IDs			-	IDs		
MODE Required	10	1			19	1			21	1		

a/ Includes 4 AAG, and 3 Third Country Participant Training Positions.

b/ Includes 2 Part-time positions.

c/ Includes 5 Part-time positions.

TABLE VII

FUNCTIONS	FY 82 MINIMUM				FY 82 CURRENT				FY 82 AAPL			
	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT
Executive Direction	4	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	4	-		
Program Planning	2	4			2	4			2	4		
Project Design	3	3			3	3			3	3		
Project Implementation	12	29		2	12	29		2	13	30		2
Financial Management	1	8			1	8			1	8		
Mission Support		12		2		12		2		12		2
Non Mission Specific		7 <u>a/</u>				7 <u>a/</u>				7 <u>a/</u>		
TOTAL.....	22	63 <u>c/</u>	-	4	22	63 <u>c/</u>		4	23	64 <u>c/</u>		4
PLUS: PASAs (OE & Program)	-				-				-			
LESS: JAO Details	-	IDIs			-	IDIs			-	IDIs		
MODE Required	22	1			22	1			23	1		

a/ Includes 4 AAG and 3 Third Country Participant Training Positions.

c/ Includes 5 Part-time positions.

TABLE VII (A)

PROGRAM AND OPERATING EXPENSE FUNDED CONTRACT PERSONNEL

IN WORK YEARS

Category	FY 79		FY 80		FY 81		FY 82	
	US	FN	US	FN	US	FN	US	FN
<u>PROGRAM FUNDED</u> ^{a/}	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2
1. Personal Services Contracts	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2
2. Institutional Contracts								
A. Host Country								
B. AID Direct								
C. Other								
3. Other (Explain)								
<u>OPERATING EXPENSE</u>								
<u>FUNDED CONTRACTS</u>	-	-	1	1	2	2	2	3
1. Personal Services Contracts	-	-	1	1 *	2	2 *	2	3 *
2. Institutional Contracts ^{b/}								
3. Other (Explain)								
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>

* Short term contracts .

^{a/} Excludes PDS-funded short term consultants .

^{b/} Maintenance , Security Guard Services et. al. provided by Embassy under FAAS .

TABLE VIII
OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY

COST SUMMARIES

	FY 1979			FY 1980			FY 1981		
	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	607.8	10.4	58.4	838.8	12.5	67.1	1,138.2	20.0	56.9
FN Direct Hire	256.4	43.5	5.9	304.4	46.2	6.6	412.5	54.2	7.6
US Contract Pers.	11.0	1.0	11.0	8.0	0.2	1.6	92.0	3.0	30.7
FN Contract Pers.	-	-	-	5.0	1.4	3.6	5.0	1.4	3.6
Housing Expense	126.8	9.2	13.8	245.9	18.0	13.7	288.8	23.0	12.6
Office Operations	373.2	xx	xx	516.2	xx	xx	558.7	xx	xx
Total Budget	1,375.2	xxx	xxx	1,918.3	xx	xx	2,495.2	xx	xx
Mission Allotment	668.9*	xxx	xxx	1,055.0	xx	xx	1,443.7	xx	xx
PAAS	185.3	xxx	xxx	231.5	xx	xx	158.3	xx	xx
Trust Fund	-	xxx	xxx	-	xx	xx	-	xx	xx

* Actual obligations.

TABLE VIII**COST SUMMARIES**

	FY 1982 MINIMUM			FY 1982 CURRENT			FY 1982 AAPL		
	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,189.9	21.5	55.3	1,189.9	21.5	55.3	1,226.3	22.0	55.7
FN Direct Hire	479.5	62.2	7.7	479.5	62.2	7.7	481.5	62.7	7.7
US Contract Pers.	15.0	1.0	15.0	15.0	1.0	15.0	15.0	1.0	15.0
FN Contract Pers.	10.0	2.5	4.0	10.0	2.5	4.0	10.0	2.5	4.0
Housing Expense	276.6	22.0	12.6	276.6	22.0	12.6	290.4	23.0	12.6
Office Operations	624.2	xx	xx	624.2	xx	xx	624.2	xx	xx
Total Budget	2,595.2	xx	xx	2,595.2	xx	xx	2,647.4	xx	xx
Mission Allotment	1,482.9	xx	xx	1,482.9	xx	xx	1,516.4	xx	xx
FAAS	186.8	xx	xx	186.8	xx	xx	186.8	xx	xx
Trust Fund	-	xx	xx	-	xx	xx	-	xx	xx

TABLE VIII - A**OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY - AAG - AAP, New Delhi****COST SUMMARIES**

US Direct Hire

FN Direct Hire

US Contract Pers.

FN Contract Pers.

Housing Expense

Office Operations (Operational Travel)

Total Budget

Mission Allotment

FAAS

Trust Fund

FY 1979			FY 1980			FY 1981		
(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
23.4	3.3	7.1	31.5	4	7.9	36.9	4	9.2
10.6	xx	xx	25.0	xx	xx	33.0	xx	xx
34.0	xxx	xxx	56.5	xx	xx	69.9	xx	xx
34.0*	xxx	xxx	56.5	xx	xx	69.9	xx	xx
	xxx	xxx		xx	xx		xx	xx
	xxx	xxx		xx	xx		xx	xx

* Actual Obligations.

INDIA: FY 82 ABS

TABLE VIII - A
OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY - AAG - AAP, New Delhi

COST SUMMARIES

US Direct Hire

FN Direct Hire

US Contract Pers.

FN Contract Pers.

Housing Expense

Office Operations (Operational travel)

Total Budget

Mission Allotment

FAAS

Trust Fund

FY 1982 MINIMUM			FY 1982 CURRENT			FY 1982 AAPL		
(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
37.3	4	9.3	37.3	4	9.3	37.3	4	9.3
30.0	xx	xx	30.0	xx	xx	30.0	xx	xx
67.3	xx	xx	67.3	xx	xx	67.3	xx	xx
67.3	xx	xx	67.3	xx	xx	67.3	xx	xx
	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx

**TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING
POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 19 80- 1982**
(By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

DECISION UNIT
INDIA

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS									
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982					
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	Minimum		Current		AAPL	
					USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH
<u>EXECUTIVE DIRECTION</u>										
<u>Director's Office</u>										
Director	1		1		1					
Deputy Director	1		1		1					
All Others	2		2		2					
Sub-Total Executive Direction	4		4		4					
<u>PROGRAM PLANNING</u>										
<u>Program Office</u>										
Program Officer	1		1		1					
Program Specialist		1		1		1				
Program Economist				1		1				
All Other		1		1		1				
<u>Food for Development Office</u>										
Food for Peace Officer	1		1		1					
All Other		1		1		1				
Sub-Total Program Planning	2	3	2	4	2	4				
<u>PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION</u>										
<u>Program Office</u>										
Asst. Program Officer	1		1		1					
Asst. Program Officer (Evaluation)					1					

AID 1990-18 (4-80)

**TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING
POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 19 80- 1982**
(By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

**DECISION UNIT
INDIA**

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS									
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982					
					Minimum		Current		AAPL	
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH
PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION (Contd.)										
<u>Program Office (Contd.)</u>										
Program Specialist				1		1				
Librarian				1		1				
All Others		1		2		2				
<u>Legal Office</u>										
Legal Officer		1		1		1				
All Other		1		1		1				
<u>Food for Development Office</u>										
Asst. Food for Peace Officer	1		1		1					
Oilseeds Coop. Project Officer		1		1		1				
Evaluation Officer		1		1		1				
Asst. Evaluation Officers		2		3		3				
Program Specialists (Monitoring)		2		2		2				
IDI	1									
All Others		1		2		2				
<u>Agriculture & Rural Development Office</u>										
Agr. & Rural Development Officer	1		1		1					
Asst. Agr. & Rural Development Officer	1		1		1					
Irrigation Engineer	1		1		1					
Agr. Research Officer			1		1					
Agr. Project Manager			1		1					
Agr. Economist		1		1		1				
Program Specialist (Agr.)		1		1		1				

AID 1530-18 (4-80)

**TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING
POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 19 80- 1982**
(By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

DECISION UNIT - INDIA

30

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS									
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982					
					Minimum		Current		AAPL	
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH
<u>PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION (Contd.)</u>										
<u>Agriculture & Rural Development Office (Contd.)</u>										
Irrigation Technician				1		1				
Agriculturist				1		1				
All Others		1		2		2				1
<u>Health, Nutrition & Population Office</u>										
Health/FP Development Officer	1		1		1					
Family Planning Officer	1		1		1					
Nutrition Officer	1		1		1					
Population Specialist		1		1		1				
Public Health Physician				1		1				
Program Assistant				1		1				
All Others		3		3		3				
<u>Capital Development Office</u>										
Capital Resources Development Officer	1		1		1					
Deputy Capital Resources Development Officer	1		1		1					
Asst. Capital Resources Development Officer	1		1		1					
Natural Resources Project Officer									1	
IDI			1		1					
Civil Engineer		1		1		1				
Project Development Specialist		1		1		1				
Loan Specialist		2		1		1				
All Others		1		2		2				
Sub-Total Project Design & Implementation	12	22	14	32	15	32			1	1

AID 1590-18 (4-80)

TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING
POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 1980-1982
 (By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

DECISION UNIT

INDIA

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS									
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982					
					Minimum		Current		AAPL	
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH
<u>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</u>										
Controller	1		1		1					
Accountants		2		2		3				
Budget Analyst		1		1		1				
Voucher Auditor/Examiner		1		2		2				
All Others		1		2		2				
Sub-Total Financial Management	1	5	1	7	1	8				
<u>MISSION SUPPORT</u>										
Personnel Specialist		1		1		1				
Procurement & Supply Specialist		1		1		1				
Procurement & Supply Assistant		1		1		1				
Purchasing Assistant		1		1		1				
All Others		7		8		8				
Sub-Total Mission Support		11		12		12				
<u>NON-MISSION SPECIFIC:</u>										
<u>AAG - Area Audit Post</u> 1/										
Supervisory Auditor		1		1		1				
Auditors		2		2		2				
All Other		1		1		1				

AID 1980-18 (4-80)

1/ Four Auditor Positions are excluded from USAID position ceiling.

**TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING
POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 1980-1982**
(By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

DECISION UNIT
INDIA

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS									
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982					
					Minimum		Current		AAPL	
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH
<u>Participant Training Branch 2/</u>										
Participant Training Specialist		1		1		1				
Participant Training Asst.		1		1		1				
All Other		1		1		1				
Sub-Total Non-Mission Specific:		7		7		7				
Total Increment:	19	48	21	62	22	63	-	-	1	1
CUMULATIVE TOTAL:	19	48 ^{3/}	21	62	22	63	22	63	23	64
Full Time	(19)	(43)	(21)	(57)	(22)	(58)	(22)	(58)	(23)	(59)
Part Time		(5)		(5)		(5)		(5)		(5)
<p><u>2/</u> Three Third Country Training positions are included in USAID position ceiling.</p> <p><u>3/</u> Excludes 9 Approved but Frozen FNDH positions.</p>										

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING AND WORD PROCESSING NARRATIVE

1. Automatic Data Processing

The current FY 80 ADP plan for the New Delhi Diplomatic Mission calls for receipt and installation of a Wang Laboratories VS-2200 minicomputer at USICA. The expected operational date of this equipment is approximately July 1, 1980. The specific configuration of the computer system is one half million bytes of internal memory for the CPU and 300 million bytes of external disk storage; in addition to a 600 line per minute printer there are 22 terminals, models 2246 C/R, and 11 (40 cps) printers. The system has a capacity for 32 terminals. Eight of the terminals are exclusively for Embassy use and 14 will be used by USICA. The remaining capacity is available for USAID and other agency use.

The Embassy expects to utilize the minicomputer for four applications during FY 1980, each of which will benefit USAID as a part of the overall Mission: Post Property System; Residential Property Management System; Personnel System; and Visitor System. USAID hopes that AID/W is participating in the development of the Post Property System which we would like to use with our USAID data base if elements required by AID are included. ICA also plans a number of systems in the near future, but these are not as applicable to USAID as the Embassy FAAS applications.

USAID plans to use the new Mission minicomputer as rapidly as possible. We look forward to the new Mission Accounting and Control System (MACS) and hope that the USAID/Tegucigalpa surveys and statistical analysis systems may be generalizable for use by other Missions.

2. Word Processing

During FY 1981 the Embassy expects that Wang Laboratories will have overcome a software support problem and that the Mission will be able to use the Wang VS-2200 for word processing applications. A recent Embassy word processing survey shows that USAID could justify at this time the use of a stand-alone system if the availability of word processing as a computer application were not imminent. The Embassy has requested purchase of three Wang Word Processing System 25s pending the gearing up of the mini-computer for this application. (The stand-alone systems would then be passed on to

the Consulates General in India.) USAID clerical personnel will be trained on these units.

3. Budget Plan

USAID has included four Wang Model 2246/R terminals and two printers in our FY 1981 NXP Plan, and two terminals and one printer in the FY 1982 procurement plan. We believe that word processing will be the first USAID major use of the minicomputer in New Delhi, followed closely by use of the MACS system. We also have included a small amount in our budget for systems analysis and programming for possible program development here, probably in conjunction with TDY help from SER/DM. We previously have suggested that the large India PL 480 Title II program might well benefit from the computerization of at least some of its records and monitoring systems.

Table VIII-B

Obligations and Inventory of ADP and Word
Processing System
(\$ 000)

	<u>FY 1980</u>	<u>FY 1981</u>	<u>FY 1982</u>
A. <u>Capital Investments</u>			
1. Purchase of ADP Equipment	-	29.1	12.1
2. Purchase of Software	-	-	-
Sub-Total	-	29.1	12.1
B. <u>Personnel</u>			
1. Compensation, Benefits, Travel	-	-	-
2. Work-year	-	-	-
Sub-Total	-	-	-
C. <u>Equipment Rental and Other Operating Costs</u>			
1. ADP Equipment (ADPE) Rentals	-	6.5	6.5
2. Supplies & Leased Software	-	2.5	2.5
Sub-Total	-	9.0	9.0
D. <u>Commercial Services</u>			
1. ADP Service Bureau	-	-	-
2. Systems Analysis & Programming	-	2.0	4.0
3. ADPE Maintenance (if separate from item C.1)	-	-	-
Sub-Total	-	2.0	4.0
E. Total Obligations	-	40.1	25.1
F. <u>Interagency Services</u>			
1. Payments	-	-	-
2. Offsetting Collections	-	-	-
Sub-Total	-	-	-
G. Grand Total	-	40.1	25.1
	=====	=====	=====

Note: Total budget to be financed with OE dollars.

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
PROJECT BUDGETS AND OBLIGATIONS
TO MEET SPECIAL CONCERNS
(THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

36

TABLE X

DECISION UNIT: 386 INDIA

APPROPRIATION: HEALTH

Project Number and Title: 386-0455 MALARIA CONTROL

A. Budget in CP: FY 1980 - \$10,000 Budget in ABS: FY 1980 - \$ 0

FY 1981 - \$25,000 FY 1981 - \$ 0

FY 1982 - Minimum: \$ 0 Current: \$ 0 AAPL: \$ 0

B. Obligations To Meet Special Concerns:

<u>ADP</u> <u>Item</u>	<u>Concern</u>	<u>Sub</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>----- FY 1980 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1981 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1982 Budget in ABS -----</u>		
			<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>Minimum:</u>	<u>Current:</u>	<u>APPL:</u>
2602	ENVR	8	\$ 7,500	\$ 0	\$18,750	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
PROJECT BUDGETS AND OBLIGATIONS
TO MEET SPECIAL CONCERNS
(THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

TABLE X

DECISION UNIT: 386 INDIA

APPROPRIATION: SELECTED
DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Project Number and Title: 386-0465 TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE RURAL POOR

A. Budget in CP: FY 1980 - \$3,000 Budget in ABS: FY 1980 - \$ 0

FY 1981 - \$ 0 FY 1981 - \$ 0

FY 1982 - Minimum: \$ 0 Current: \$ 0 AAPL: \$ 0

B. Obligations To Meet Special Concerns:

<u>ADP</u> <u>Item</u>	<u>Concern</u>	<u>Sub</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>----- FY 1980 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1981 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1982 Budget in ABS -----</u>		
			<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>Minimum:</u>	<u>Current:</u>	<u>AAPL:</u>
1852	ENER		\$ 2,400	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
PROJECT BUDGETS AND OBLIGATIONS
 TO MEET SPECIAL CONCERNS
 (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

63
00

TABLE X

DECISION UNIT: 386 INDIA

APPROPRIATION: AGRICULTURE,
RURAL DEV. AND NUTRITION

Project Number and Title: 386-0467 RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION

A. Budget in CP: FY 1980 - \$ 25,000 Budget in ABS: FY 1980 - \$ 15,500

FY 1981 - \$ 10,000

FY 1981 - \$ 20,000

FY 1982 - Minimum: \$ 0 Current: \$ 0 AAPL: \$ 0

B. Obligations To Meet Special Concerns:

<u>ADP</u>		<u>Sub</u>	<u>----- FY 1980 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1981 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1982 Budget in ABS -----</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Concern</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>Minimum:</u>	<u>Current:</u>	<u>APPL:</u>
2601	ENVR	5	\$ 12,500	\$ <u>15,500</u>	\$ <u>5,000</u>	\$ <u>20,000</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
PROJECT BUDGETS AND OBLIGATIONS
TO MEET SPECIAL CONCERNS
(THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

TABLE X

DECISION UNIT: 386 INDIA

APPROPRIATION: AGRICULTURE,
RURAL DEV. & NUTRITION

Project Number and Title: 386-0475 MADHYA PRADESH SOCIAL FORESTRY *

A. Budget in CP: FY 1980 - \$ 0 Budget in ABS: FY 1980 - \$ 0

FY 1981 - \$ 5000 FY 1981 - \$ 9,000

FY 1982 - Minimum: \$ 16,000 Current: \$ 0 AAPL: \$ 0

B. Obligations To Meet Special Concerns:

<u>ADP</u> <u>Item</u>	<u>Concern</u>	<u>Sub</u> <u>Code</u>	<u>----- FY 1980 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1981 Budget -----</u>		<u>----- FY 1982 Budget in ABS -----</u>		
			<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>In CP</u>	<u>In ABS</u>	<u>Minimum:</u>	<u>Current:</u>	<u>APPL:</u>
2603	ENVR	3	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ 5,000	\$ <u>9,000</u>	\$ <u>16,000</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
ADD	ENER	-	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ 5,000	\$ <u>9,000</u>	\$ <u>16,000</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>

* This is an Energy and Environment project contributing to the special concerns raised at the same time.
Therefore, full funding is shown against both concerns.

DECISION UNIT: INDIA

50

PROJECT NUMBER AND TITLE	APPROP	CONCERN CODE		FUNDING FOR SPECIAL CONCERN (\$000)				
				FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982		
		PRIME	SUB			MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
0468 Integrated Rural Health & Population	PN	WID	-	1,000	-	1,000	-	-
	HE	WID	-	3,000	2,000	-	-	-
0474 Alternative Energy Resources Dev.	SD	ENER	-	-	-	-	2,200	3,000
0476 Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition	FN	PVOU	-	-	1,000	1,000	-	-
0477 Karnataka Medium Irrigation	FN	ENVR	5	-	-	25,500	-	15,000
0478 Maharashtra Social Forestry	FN	ENVR	3	-	-	-	-	25,000
		ENER	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
0479 Land & Water Conservation (Small Tanks)	FN	ENVR	3	-	-	-	1,000	-
		ENVR	4	-	-	-	1,500	-
		ENVR	5	-	-	-	4,000	-
		ENVR	6	-	-	-	500	-
		PVOL	-	-	-	-	500	-
		ENER	-	-	-	-	300	-
0480 Female Village Volunteer Project	PN	WID	-	-	-	-	5,000	7,000
	HE	WID	-	-	-	-	1,000	2,000

* FY 1982 funding is on incremental basis.

P L - 480

Table Of ContentsPL-480 NARRATIVE

	<u>Page</u>
A. <u>Overview</u>	
1. Introduction	42
2. PL-480 and the CDSS	42
3. Assessment of the GOI's Food and Nutrition Strategy	43
B. <u>Proposed PL-480 Title I Assistance</u>	
1. Introduction	47
2. India's Balance of Payments Prospects	47
3. Vegetable Oil Production and Imports	49
4. Foodgrain Production Prospects	50
C. <u>Proposed PL-480 Title II Assistance and USAID's Review of Voluntary Agency Operational Plans</u>	
1. Introduction	51
2. Nutritional Objectives	51
3. Educational Objectives	55
4. Economic and Community Development Objectives	57
5. Other Feeding Programs	58
6. PVO Recommendations for FY 1982 Programs	58
7. USAID Recommendations for FY 1982 Programs	59
8. Cost Reduction Opportunities	60
9. Discussion of Decision Package Ranking	61
10. Description of Voluntary Agency Programs	62
a. CARE	62
b. Catholic Relief Service (CRS)	63
c. Church World Service (CWS)/Lutheran World Relief (LWR)	64
d. Cooperative League of the U.S.A. (CLUSA)	65
11. In-Country Storage	65
12. Disincentive Effects	66

PL-480 SUPPORTING TABLES

Table XI - Title I/III Requirements	67
Table XII - Title I/III Supply & Distribution	68
Table XIII - Title II Statistical Tables:	
1. Summary - FY 82 Program as Recommended by USAID	69
2. CARE Proposal	70
3. CRS Proposal	71
4. CWS/LWR Proposal	73
5. CLUSA Proposal	74
PL-480 Program Ranking and Composition Table	75

INDIA: FY 82 ABS

PL-480 NARRATIVE

A. Overview

1. Introduction

USAID is recommending for FY 1982 a 454,000 metric ton (MT) PL-480 Title II program and a 50,000 MT Title I Vegetable Oil program.

The Title II program will be conducted by five U.S. voluntary and cooperative agencies: CARE, Catholic Relief Service (CRS), Church World Services (CWS), Luthern World Relief (LWR), and the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. (CLUSA). They will operate in 18 of India's 23 states at 250,000 project sites, and will reach 16.6 million beneficiaries. The Title I Vegetable Oil program will provide concessional financing covering the expected FY 1982 increase in soybean oil imports (50,000 MT) and is designed to assure needed oil supplies in the face of rapid deterioration in India's balance of payments position. The proceeds of the vegetable oils sales will provide a non-inflationary means of expanding resources for agricultural development programs during a period when domestic resource constraints will probably become more binding.

2. PL-480 and the CDSS

The CDSS groups proposed AID activities into three categories: Food Supply and Rural Employment, Fertility and Mortality Reduction and Special AID Concerns. PL-480 programs support the CDSS strategy in all of these areas.

Title II Food for Work (FFW) programs supported by CRS and CWS/LWR will provide rural employment for 710,000 recipients in FY 1982 and will contribute to increased food production through the creation of assets such as roads and irrigation works. They complement a rapidly expanding GOI public sector FFW program which had been supported by CARE until recent foodgrain surpluses made CARE support no longer necessary. The Oilseeds Cooperative Development program supported by CLUSA will expand oilseed output and create additional employment in oilseed production and processing. Title I Vegetable Oil will contribute to supplies of this critical food item, and the rupee proceeds will help sustain GOI budget allocations to agricultural programs in an increasingly constrained domestic budgetary situation.

Title II Maternal and Child Health (MCH) programs will reach an estimated 6.2 million mothers and young children in FY 1982 in support of the Fertility and Mortality Reduction objectives of the CDSS. Title II School Feeding (SF) programs will provide an estimated 9.5 million primary school children with a school lunch, primarily in rural areas and among the poorest groups (especially Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe children). The Government of India (GOI) believes that school feeding programs at the elementary level increase attendance and reduce drop-out rates, particularly among children of the poorest groups. To the extent that increased attendance for longer periods of time improves literacy and skill levels for girls, the SF programs probably also contribute to the Fertility Reduction objective. For additional details on the MCH and SF programs see pp. 38, 39, 45 and 48-50 of the CDSS.

There is abundant qualitative evidence indicating that the impact of Title II programs on the CDSS objectives (including primary education and literacy under Special AID Concerns) is significant. Most of the evidence is summarized in the Title II Interim Evaluation carried out with the assistance of the Community Systems Foundation (CSF) in 1979. The Interim Evaluation also indicated that the impact of the Title II programs on development objectives could probably be increased through further improvements in program design. USAID is now proceeding with a major effort to design quantitative evaluations of the impact of the SF and MCH programs. Initial results from these evaluations should be available in CY 1981, and are expected to provide a sound basis for qualitative improvements and possibly for eventual program expansion. The CLUSA-supported Oilseeds Cooperative Development program will include a detailed quantitative assessment of the program's impact on incomes and employment for various beneficiary groups. The FFW programs will be evaluated through a series of detailed case studies and through comparisons with FFW programs for which quantitative evaluations are already available.

3. Assessment of the GOI's Food and Nutrition Strategy

As discussed above, the PL-480 programs proposed for FY 1982 serve a number of objectives other than those of direct increases in food availabilities or improvements in nutritional status. The GOI programs for achievement of these other objectives - food production, rural employment, fertility and mortality reduction, literacy - are discussed and briefly assessed in the CDSS. Nevertheless it is also important to relate the PL-480 inputs to the overall GOI food and nutrition strategy. First, two of the programs -

Title I and Title II MCH - have increased food availability or improved nutrition as primary objectives. Second, the use of U.S. food to achieve the agricultural and rural development or education objectives of the Title II CLUSA, FFW and SF programs is justified only if food supplies in particular categories (e.g., oilseeds) or for particular groups (e.g., unskilled laborers, poor primary school children) are inadequate. Food can be used as a resource to meet various objectives only if food is needed.

Although traditionally a large net food importer, India may now have reached a point of sustainable foodgrain self-sufficiency. Even the 1979 drought, which was one of the four worst droughts in the past century, reduced foodgrain output by only 10% (from 131 million MT in 1978/79 to an estimated 118 million MT in 1979/80), and it appears that present foodgrain reserves of 15 million MT will be adequate unless 1980 is another drought year. The analysis presented in the 1980 World Bank Economic Report on India indicates that a continuation of the foodgrain production strategy of recent years and a further decline in the population growth rate should permit India to maintain foodgrain self-sufficiency over the medium and long term. With respect to the marketing and distribution of food within the country, the basic procurement, storage and distribution policies and facilities of the Food Corporation of India (FCI) have been successful in recent years in moving foodgrains from surplus to deficit regions and in supplying foodgrains for Food for Work and drought relief programs in poorer districts. Because of the high priority accorded to food distribution by the GOI, the transport constraints which have plagued other sectors of the economy recently have affected foodgrain movements much less seriously. Although continued expansion and improvement will be necessary, the GOI marketing and transportation systems should be generally adequate to assure effective food distribution within India.

While achievement of foodgrain self sufficiency recently has been a major achievement, it has been accompanied by continued widespread malnutrition. According to the World Bank Economic Report, foodgrain availability of 170 kilograms (kg.) per capita in 1978/79 represented adequate caloric consumption on average for the India population. However, since food consumption mirrors income distribution, a large percentage of the population was unable to reach this average. Adequate estimates of the extent of India's "nutrition gap" in these terms are not available, but the GOI Planning Commission's poverty line, which is defined in terms of the income needed to purchase an adequate diet, provides a first approximation. Depending on whether the "reduced" or the "standard" poverty line is used, the estimate of the number of people suffering from malnutrition is 180

to 320 million, or 28% to 49% of the total population. For further details, see pp. 2-7 of the CDSS.

If 80-90% of these people suffer only from mild malnutrition which does not involve significant functional impairment (as argued in a recent Ford Foundation paper), the number suffering from moderate and severe malnutrition would be 18 to 64 million, most of whom are probably children. If we also assume that moderate and severe malnutrition could be eliminated by an annual foodgrain supplement of 50 kg per capita, the maximum foodgrain requirement would be 3.2 million MT. This amount, which is only a portion of present foodgrain reserves, suggests that reduction of serious malnutrition in India may be a more manageable task than is generally thought, although achievement of the degree of "precision targetting" implied would be neither cheap nor easy. USAID will attempt to develop better "nutrition gap" estimates during preparation of the Project Paper for the proposed FY 1981 Integrated Mother/Child Nutrition project.

For the mildly malnourished, the GOI's nutrition strategy merges with the overall poverty reduction strategy discussed in the CDSS - the problem is essentially one of increasing incomes and the effective demand for food. This general approach is complemented by the system of subsidized food distribution points (Fair Price Shops) and by the GOI Food for Work program, which will utilize a projected 3.5 million MT of wheat and rice in 1980/81. Both of these programs are apparently working reasonably well and are being expanded.

For the moderately and severely malnourished, the Central Government and the various States sponsor targeted feeding programs. The largest of these interventions is the Special Nutrition Program (SNP), reaching some 6.7 million beneficiaries consisting of children age 0 to 6, pregnant women, and lactating mothers. This is a major program started in 1971 to address the serious problem of malnutrition among the vulnerable groups. The program is popular but has many weaknesses due to ineffective targetting and the poor performance in integrating the feeding component with essential health inputs and nutrition education. A more successful but smaller government intervention is the Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) which provides an impressive package of health, education, and food supplements to some 1.3 million women and children in 150 administrative blocks. The program has been informally assessed as being effective, and an unpublished two year survey conducted by the All India Institute of Medical Sciences indicates that the ICDS has reduced the incidence of severe malnutrition by more than 50 percent in the targeted blocks, but at a cost which precludes nationwide replication. The Integrated Maternal/Child

Nutrition project proposed by USAID for an FY 1981 start will attempt to combine the effectiveness of the ICDS program with the lower costs of the SNP.

In addition to the SNP and the ICDS there are several other MCH feeding programs in the various states reaching a total of 10 million beneficiaries. Besides the GOI inputs, assistance to these public sector nutrition programs is provided by CARE, WFP and UNICEF.

The attainment of foodgrain self-sufficiency has also been accompanied by a growing gap between edible oil consumption and production. There are a number of programs underway to increase edible oil production including a large-scale dairy development program (to increase supplies of butter and ghee) and the CLUSA Title II Oilseed Cooperative Development project (to increase peanut and peanut oil production). Nevertheless it will take a number of years to attain the GOI target of 4.5% oilseed output growth to close the consumption - production gap. A resumed Title I Vegetable Oil program will assist the GOI in closing the edible oil gap while expanded oilseed development efforts are being pursued.

The proposed new Title I program and the proposals for continuation of the ongoing Title II programs are discussed in greater detail below. We believe that the proposed programs will contribute significantly to the GOI's efforts to move beyond foodgrain self-sufficiency to food security for all.

B. Proposed PL-480 Title I Assistance

1. Introduction

Large scale PL-480 Title I sales to India took place throughout the 50's and 60's without interruption until 1971. After a few years hiatus, Title I sales were resumed in FY 1975 to respond to the crop failures of 1972-73 and 1974-75. Agreements for FY 1975 and FY 1976 covered 1.2 million tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of rice. Title I programs for wheat and rice were not continued after FY 1976 because the succession of good harvests which began in 1975 made foodgrain imports unnecessary. In FY 1977 and FY 1978 the U.S. concluded Title I agreements with the GOI for 50,000 tons and 60,000 tons of vegetable oil. Although India's vegetable oil imports remained above one million tons per year after 1978, vegetable oil sales under Title I were discontinued because of the strength of India's balance of payments position and limited budget availabilities.

India's balance of payments position is now weakening, and the medium-term prospects are not encouraging. At the March 1980 meetings of the Indo-U.S. Joint Economic and Commercial Sub-commission, the GOI requested that the U.S. resume Title I vegetable oil sales. The U.S. delegation noted that resumption of sales in FY 1980 or FY 1981 would be extremely difficult, but stated a willingness to consider a Title I program for FY 1982.

USAID recommends resumption of Title I sales in FY 1982 at a level of 50,000 tons, which is approximately the expected increase in India's 1982 soybean oil imports. At the prices projected by USDA for FY 1982 (\$827 per metric ton in barrels, rounded to \$800), the value of the proposed Title I Agreement would be \$40 million (see Table XI). The relevant factors are discussed in greater detail below.

2. India's Balance of Payments Prospects

Following the adjustment to the oil crisis of 1973 and the crop failures of 1972-73 and 1974-75, India's balance of payments improved dramatically. This was reflected in an increase of external reserves from 2.7 months' imports coverage in 1974-75 to 9.2 months' coverage in 1978-79. The improvement was due to a number of factors, including good agricultural performance (which made major foodgrain imports unnecessary), improved prices for India's exports, relatively stable import prices, and strong growth in net receipts from invisibles,

principally worker remittances. This improving balance of payments situation permitted a significant liberalization of imports, which increased at a rate of 12.5% per annum (in volume terms) between 1975-76 and 1978-79.

The balance of payments began to weaken in 1979-80. The overwhelming negative factor was the series of oil price hikes, which increased petroleum import costs from about \$2 billion in Indian Fiscal Year 1978-79 (April-March) to over \$4 billion in 1979-80. Although external reserves including gold increased slightly to \$7.6 billion as of March 1980 (as compared with \$7.4 billion in March 1979), they have already declined from their peak and represent only about seven months' import coverage. Based on current estimates of medium-term trends in import and export volume and prices, and trends in invisibles and net aid flows, the IBRD has projected growing balance of payments deficits beginning in 1980-81; these deficits would result in a decline in reserves to 5.5 months' coverage of imports in 1980-81, 3.8 months' coverage in 1981-82, and only two months' coverage in 1982-83.

Thus the balance of payments situation will be very difficult by 1981-82. Unless the GOI can bring about a significant improvement in its external position through some combination of export promotion, import substitution, and increased net aid flows, the imposition of import restrictions could again become a necessity. (For details, see the World Bank Economic Report, Chapter 4.)

The deterioration in the balance of payments situation is an aspect of the current shift from a position of resource surplus in the Indian economy to a position of resource scarcity. Both the savings rate and tax rate are at relatively high levels for a country with India's per capita GNP, and increased domestic resource mobilization will consequently be quite difficult. PL-480 Title I Vegetable Oil, in addition to reducing the immediate foreign exchange cost of maintaining an essential import, will provide additional budgetary resources by giving the GOI access to the proceeds of the sale of the oil. This source of financing is non-inflationary (unlike additional government borrowing from the Reserve Bank of India) and allocation of the proceeds to agricultural and rural development programs will provide an added degree of protection for these programs during a period of increasing budgetary pressures.

3. Oilseed Production and Imports

Next to foodgrains, edible oil is the most important food staple in the diet of the average Indian. Per capita consumption of vegetable oil in India is one of the lowest in the world and availability on a per capita basis has been steadily declining over a number of years.

Production of vegetable oil (excluding butter and ghee) has been stagnating since 1975-76, when the total output was estimated to be about three million MT. Output slumped to 2.8 million MT in 1976-77 and production in the following year was slightly smaller. Production in 1978-79 was marginally better at 2.9 million MT, while last year's output is estimated at 2.8 million MT. To cover the gap between demand and supply, imports have risen from about 0.2 million MT in 1975-76 to over one million MT in 1978-79. Imports in the 1979-80 oilseeds marketing year (October-September) are estimated at slightly over 1.2 million MT, including 80,000 MT in Title II and Canadian assistance (see Table XII).

It will be difficult to expand oilseeds production rapidly in the near future. The quality of land planted to oilseeds is generally poor; since the mid-sixties better grades of land have been gradually shifted to foodgrains. The varieties grown are mostly traditional and low yielding; and some are preferred by farmers because of their proven ability to survive despite lack of moisture over long periods (as in the case of sesamum). Barely 4 percent of the area under oilseeds is under irrigation. Rapid production increases through yield improvement will not be achieved easily under these circumstances, although the GOI is targetting a growth rate of 4.5% per annum for the five major oilseeds (peanut, castor, sesamum, rape and mustard, and flax seed) and is expanding research and extension efforts for oilseed production.

The prospects are more hopeful over the medium term, given the likelihood of increased GOI efforts to expand production of crops other than foodgrains, the expected expansion in irrigation coverage and fertilizer supplies, and the potential for yield increases and improved incentives under programs such as the Oilseeds Cooperative Development project being supported by CLUSA under Title II. If successful, the latter program would increase average peanut yields from 1.1 MT per hectare to 1.35 MT per hectare and

double the net income from peanuts for cooperating farmers.

Preliminary USDA projections (see Table XII) indicate that India's vegetable oil consumption will increase by about 150,000 MT in FY 1981, and that 50,000 MT of this increase will be met by expanded domestic production; the remaining 100,000 MT gap would be met by increased imports. Projections are not available for the period beyond FY 1981, but we have assumed similar increases in consumption, production and imports for FY 1982. Since soybean oil has accounted for half of imports in the recent past, the 50,000 MT Title I program recommended by USAID for FY 1982 would assure that the soybean oil component of the increase in vegetable oil imports could be financed despite increasing balance of payments pressures.

Since the Title I Vegetable Oil would account for less than 5% of imports and less than 2% of domestic production, there is little risk that the Title I imports would act as a disincentive to production. For a brief review of the literature on PL-480 disincentive effects in India, see pp. 47-49 of the FY 1981 India ABS.

4. Foodgrain Production Prospects

As noted briefly in Section A above, India weathered the 1979 drought without having to import foodgrains, and government-held foodgrain stocks as of April 1980 still stood at 15 million tons (only 5 million tons below the peak). The prospects for long-term foodgrain self-sufficiency now appear reasonably good. The projections prepared by the World Bank Economic Report indicate that India could meet its foodgrain requirements through the year 2000 with foodgrain production growth averaging 2.5% per year. This is below the GOI long-term target growth rate for foodgrains of 2.7% (1977-78 to 1992-93), but it is above the trend growth rate for 1967-68 to 1977-78 of 2.4%. The World Bank projections assume that population growth will continue to decline from 1.9 - 2.0% per annum at present, and will average 1.75% to the year 2000. For details see Chapter 2 of the World Bank Economic Report.

The adjustment of sustained foodgrain self-sufficiency will require continued progress both in increasing production and reducing population growth, but past performance suggests that this is feasible. Resumption of Title I foodgrain sales should consequently not be necessary. If there is serious drought in 1980 or 1981, however, foodgrain imports would be needed and Title I sales could be considered.

C. Proposed PL 480 Title II Assistance and USAID's Review of Voluntary Agency Operational Plans

1. Introduction

The PVOs have submitted proposals for FY 82 which, after review, have resulted in a USAID recommended program of 454,335 MT of commodities having an estimated value of \$162,590,000 and which will reach 16,580,000 recipients. The USAID recommended program does not include any of the increases that were requested by either CARE, or CRS, however, these increases can be seen in the PVO submitted tables at pages 70-74 where they have been included without change.

The various components of the PVO programs have been broadly grouped in the following narrative as follows: Health/Nutrition, Educational incentive and economic development. Within these groupings program variations are defined and described in more detail. In addition, the India CDSS, Section I, paras 8 and 10 provides additional information on the nutrition and educational elements of the recommended program and Section II, G addresses the need for an evaluation of the program and the directions the evaluation process will take.

2. Nutritional Objectives

The Title II MCH program is reaching an estimated 6.2 million mothers and young children in support of the fertility and mortality reduction objectives of the CDSS

The PVO's conduct a variety of maternal child health programs. These range from projects where a Title II ration is provided for use at home and in which little or no other activities are engaged in, to projects in which many sophisticated measures are undertaken in an effort to have a lasting effect on the health of the recipients. The PVO's have been upgrading their MCH programs over a period of years and will continue to do so at a rate consistent with resource availability.

a. CRS - Maternal Child Health (MCH)

The primary nutritional objectives of the Maternal Child Health Program are:

- 1) to deliver a package of health-care services to the pre-school child and expectants and nursing mothers including preventive health-care, immunization, food supplements, health and nutrition education and referral services;
- 2) to rehabilitate malnourished children;
- 3) to create awareness among the mothers and in the community that the quality of life, the economic status, freedom from communicable diseases, learning ability, productivity and nutritional status are all inter-related.

With a \$500,000 grant from its New York headquarters CRS is implementing a Nutrition Education Program (NEP) in 25 percent of its MCH feeding program. The project emphasizes nutrition/health education and provides for professional nutritionists, training of the center workers, and education of the mothers and pregnant women. This program is designed to include a complete education element which will do much to change the attitudes of implementors as well as recipients in the program. There are 170,000 NEP recipients of the total 630,000 MCH recipients in the CRS program.

In practice, many of the other MCH sites provide little more than a take home Title II ration, CRS is presently evaluating the NEP program and assuming the assessment is positive, will work to phase its MCH sites to a more sophisticated type of operation including all of the above listed objectives and services.

b. CARE - Maternal Child Health (MCH)

CARE's intermediate goal is to provide each MCH beneficiary with an increased daily intake of calories and protein. In order that the increased food intake can have

maximum nutritional benefit it should be linked with other inputs such as preventive health care, immunization and nutritional education. Therefore, an important goal is to use the food resources to obtain additional inputs from the State Governments and the GOI to upgrade the program so that gradually all of the MCH feeding programs will be providing a complete package of health and nutrition services.

The CARE program for mothers and children age 0 to 6 is operational in 14 States and takes on various forms ranging from feeding only to highly effective integrated programs. The feeding-only category would account for some 2 million recipients and the remaining 3.5 million MCH beneficiaries receive one or several other inputs such as nutrition education, immunization, and basic health services. In collaboration with its GOI counterparts CARE is committed to phasing over all MCH program activities from simple food distributions to a more complete package to include essential health services and nutrition education.

The previous Government included nutrition as a priority in the Minimum Needs Program of its Five Year Plan. We are confident that the present Government is equally committed to this program. With a grant from UNICEF the GOI has been sponsoring regional workshops for the MCH program. Three have already been held at Srinagar, Goa, and Calcutta. The fourth is scheduled for Simla in June 1980. This effort is part of the GOI concern for addressing the problems of malnutrition and mortality among young children through improved management and increased integrated services in the MCH programs. The GOI is well aware of the weaknesses in the program and is endeavoring to make the program more effective within the parameters of available resources.

The GOI has asked external donors to continue their support in this area. CARE and the World Food Program have agreed to continue commodity support. UNICEF has

been providing funds for regional workshops and technical assistance; it also has provided some funds for the training of the nutrition aides involved in the MCH program. The GOI itself has been funding and staffing an upgraded, integrated MCH program in 150 administrative blocks called the Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS) which provides ancillary health services, nutrition education, better selection and targeting, and training of the workers in addition to supplementary feeding.

The GOI has asked USAID to support the extension of the integrated MCH approach to another 100 blocks. This is the basis for USAID project 386-0476 Integrated Maternal and Child Nutrition. The purpose of this latter project is "to reduce the prevalence of severe malnutrition and moderate malnutrition for all children 0 to 5 years in the target areas and to determine the technical feasibility and cost of improving the birthweights of children." Ideally the GOI hopes eventually to replicate the integrated approach of the ICDS at a still effective but more realistic cost to some 2000 blocks (out of 5500 blocks) where the malnutrition and mortality rates are highest.

Other significant nutrition interventions have recently been started including CARE's Composite Program for Women and Pre-schoolers (CPWP) in Kerala State, and the IBRD Nutrition Project in Tamil Nadu. The timing seems most appropriate for AID and other external donors to support the Central and State Governments in their serious efforts to reduce malnutrition and mortality among the vulnerable groups.

c. CWS/LWR - Maternal Child Health (MCH)

The MCH programs provide Title II food as a means of improving nutrition of children, pregnant women and nursing mothers especially amongst the poorer and more backward sections of society.

CWS/LWR is phasing over to modified MCH program which includes nutrition and health services such as immunizations, periodic check-ups, or community based comprehensive health service projects in which age/weight charts are used to track infant and child growth. CWS/LWR plans to drop those MCH centers which are unable to adapt to the modified MCH program. There are 40,000 recipients in this program.

3. Educational Objectives

The qualitative assessment of the Title II program undertaken by the Community Systems Foundation in 1979 indicated that the School Feeding program was achieving the educational objective of enhancing and stabilizing primary school attendance. This objective of SF was highlighted in the Special AID Concerns section of the approved CDSS. The Title II SF provides an estimated 9.5 million primary school children with a mid-day-meal primarily in the rural areas and among the poorest groups, especially scheduled caste and scheduled tribe children.

a. CARE - Mid-Day Meals (MDM)

At the request of 13 State Governments CARE is sponsoring a school feeding program in rural areas for mainly tribal children. The purpose of the program is to:

- 1) serve as an incentive to children to attend school and to stabilize that attendance;
- 2) improve the diet of school children.

There are 9,000,000 recipients in this program.

The MDM program is an official activity of the Indian State Governments in support of their priority goal to universalize primary school education within this decade.

The goal is uppermost in the Minimum Needs Program of the GOI Five Year Plan. In addition to school construction, training of new teachers, and motivational campaigns for parents and communities, the government considers the MDM program as an essential factor in recruiting children and stabilizing their attendance at school. This is particularly true among boys and girls from tribal, harijan, and landless families. USAID is discussing with the GOI Ministry of Education and CARE a major quantitative study of the MDM program to test whether these working assumptions are correct.

CARE places a high priority on this rural program and expends considerable staff time and resources on its implementation. USAID is impressed with CARE's efforts and accomplishment in this educational project in support of a priority program of the government. USAID supports the educational goals of the MDM and will continue to encourage CARE to target the program in those rural areas and among those primary school children where the desired impact is most likely to occur.

b. CARE - Pre-School Feeding

CARE is currently feeding over a million pre-school children through approximately 29,000 schools in the States of Haryana, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh. This program serves as an incentive to bring poor children from the tribal and backward rural areas to school locations and familiarize them with daily attendance and the institutionalized setting. When they come of age they are enrolled in the schools and then participate in the MDM program. There are 1,003,000 recipients in this program.

c. CRS - School Feeding

School Feeding is used to provide nutritional support to primary school children, however, the main function of the Title II food is to serve as an incentive to motivate them to attend school. There are 485,000 recipients in this program.

4. Economic and Community Development Objectives -
Food-For-Work - CRS and CWS/LWR

The Food-for-Work (FFW) program supports the CDSS objectives of increased food supply and rural employment. The FFW activities of CRS, CWS, and LWR will provide employment for 710,000 recipients and will contribute to increased food production through the creation of assets, such as access roads and irrigation schemes.

a. CARE - Phase-over to GOI

The highly successful CARE-assisted FFW public sector program was taken over by the GOI two years ago and expanded to its present commodity level of 3.5 million tons of cereals programmed each year. This has become a major program of the GOI in generating employment among the rural poor and in creating community assets in backward areas. The GOI is very serious about its FFW program and is deservedly satisfied with its results. Recently the Ministry of Agriculture which is responsible for the management of the program, expressed to USAID a willingness to share its experience and expertise in FFW with other LDC's interested in utilizing food for development activities. This is an excellent example of a phase over of a Title II program to complete host country support.

b. CRS, CWS and LWR FFW Programs

Even though the CARE public sector food-for-work program has been phased over to the GOI, the other three PVO's believe that there is still an opportunity to use Title II commodities for development activities in the private sector and in smaller village level activities. The government FFW is limited to the creation of public assets, whereas the PVO's can focus on the non-public sector as well.

The objectives of these PVO programs are as follows:

- 1) To provide employment to poor unskilled laborers.
- 2) To improve agricultural production.
- 3) To improve the economic position of the poor in the long term by creating marketable skills through FFW supported training programs.
- 4) To improve the standard of living of the poor, through the construction of houses and other amenities under FFW.

There are 600,000 recipients in the CRS program, and 110,000 recipients in the CWS/LWR program.

5. Other Feeding Programs - Catholic Relief Services (CRS) - Individual Health Cases (IHC) and Other Child Feeding (OCF)

CRS is conducting maintenance feeding in institutions running orphanages, boarding schools and hostels for underprivileged children as well as for adults who are disabled, the aged, the destitute and those who are inflicted with incurable diseases. The recipients reached by this program are:

IHC: 98,000 recipients
OCF: 118,000 recipients.

6. PVO Proposals for FY 1982 Programs

Only CARE and CRS have requested increases in their programs. CARE proposes to increase the recipient levels of the school feeding category from 9 million to 10.5 million because of the high priority the Government has given to the universalization of primary school education. The MCH recipient level for CARE remains at 5.5 million. CRS has proposed increases in all categories for an additional 249,000

recipients. A Table XIII is included in the ABS for each PVO showing the full request. See pages 70 through 74.

7. Mission Recommendations for FY 1982 PVO Programs

The Mission has given serious consideration to the increases in recipient levels proposed by the PVO's in their FY 82 ABS submissions. Because of the advice received from AID/W on the serious budgetary constraints on Title II programming, the Mission believes that no requests for increased levels should be approved without further substantive justification. The Mission is planning to do in-depth evaluations of MCH, FFW, MDM and the CLUSA oilseeds project in 1980 and 1981. The results of these evaluations will be used in reviewing the PVO's FY 82 AERs and their FY 83 ABS submissions to determine where changes in recipient levels could be made to improve the program. Contingent on the outcome of the evaluation, the Mission has straight-lined all PVO programs for FY 82 using the current year (FY 80) as the base year.

The following table compares the FY 82 program recommended by USAID with the PVO requests. The comparison is by recipient, commodity and funding levels.

FY 1982 Program Comparison of PVO Request and Mission Recommendation

a. Recipient Levels (000)

	<u>Mission Recommended</u>	<u>PVO Request</u>	<u>Difference</u>
CARE	14,499	16,091	1,592
CRS	1,931	2,180	249
CWS/LWR	150	150	-
CLUSA	N. A.	N. A.	-
Total:	<u>16,580</u>	<u>18,421</u>	<u>1,841</u>

Comparison of PVO Request and Mission Recommendation -(Contd.)b. Commodity Levels (MT)

	<u>Mission Recommended</u>	<u>PVO Request</u>	<u>Difference</u>
CARE	250,410	281,178	30,768
CRS	155,322	176,444	21,122
CWS/LWR	21,103	21,103	-
CLUSA	27,500	27,500	-
Total:	454,335	506,225 MT	51,890 MT

c. Funding Levels (\$000)

CARE	85,575	96,248	10,673
CRS	49,688	58,542	8,854
CWS/LWR	4,584	4,584	-
CLUSA	22,743	22,743	-
Total:	\$ 162,590	\$ 182,117	\$ 19,527

See also the Mission's Summary Table XIII Recommendations on page 69 and the PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition Table on pages 75-78.

8. Cost Reductions

Each of the PVO's was asked to review its programs in the context of using less expensive commodities where this could be done without dramatically changing the nutritional impact of the respective programs. As a result the following savings have been projected.

<u>Commodity Previously Used</u>			<u>Now Using</u>			<u>Anticipated Savings</u>
<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>\$Value</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>\$ Value</u>	
SF Bulgur	321,337	93,830,404	Bulgur	321,337	83,226,283	10,604,121
SF Flour	10,121	3,339,930	W. Flour	10,121	2,742,791	597,139
Oil in Cans	1,500	1,492,500	Oil in B-BLs	1,500	1,240,500	252,000
Total:						\$ 11,453,260

NOTE: Prices taken from State 110974 (FY 82 Guidance Message)

CLUSA, If arrangements can be made for use of Bulk oil in CLUSA program an additional \$5,170,000 will be saving over the cost of the oil if delivered in Barrels increasing the projected saving to \$16,623,260. CLUSA is reviewing this possibility.

9. Discussions of Decision Package Ranking

USAID, for the purpose of Decision Package ranking has, selected 11 distinct parts of the overall Title II program. These program components and their rank order have been discussed with the local representatives of the voluntary agencies, but represent the judgment of USAID rather than the VolAgs themselves. USAID strongly endorses the entire program as has been discussed in the Decision Package narratives.

Title II Activities Priority Rankings

<u>Table V</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Title II</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>\$Value</u> <u>(000's)</u>
<u>A. Minimum Decision Package</u>			
4	1	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Public-Food with additional inputs (CARE)	19,111
5	2.	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Private (CRS)	13,283
5	3.	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Private (CWS)	338
5	4.	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Private (LWR)	225
6	5.	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Public-Food alone (CARE)	14,726
9	6.	AG Oilseeds Cooperative Development (CLUSA)	22,743
10	7.	SF School Feeding, Rural Public (CARE)	44,210
11	8.	SF School Feeding, Rural Private (CRS)	4,616

Title II Activities Priority Rankings (Continued)

<u>Table V</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Title II</u> <u>Rank</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>\$Value</u> <u>(000's)</u>
12	9.	FFW Food For Work, Rural Private (CRS)	25,120
12	10.	FFW Food for Work, Rural Private (CWS)	2,416
12	11.	FFW Food for Work, Rural Private (LWR)	1,605
Total Minimum Package:			<u>148,393</u>
<u>B. Current Decision Package</u>			
18	12.	MCH Maternal/Child Health, Pre-School Food (CARE)	7,528
19	13.	SF School Feeding, Urban Public (CRS)	772
20	14.	OCF Other Child Feeding, Rural and Urban Private (CRS)	3,221
21	15.	IHC Individual Health Cases, Urban Private (CRS)	2,676
Total Current Package:			<u>14,197</u>
Total Title II Program:			<u><u>162,590</u></u>

See also the PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition Table on pages 75-78 for a breakdown of commodities and recipients.

10. Descriptions of Voluntary Agency Programsa. Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE)

CARE operates the largest Title II program in India through offices in 13 Indian States and the Delhi headquarters office with 9 Americans and 411 Indian staff members. Program activities include feeding pre-school and school children, nursing and lactating women. The basis for this program is the Indo-CARE agreement which provides for State Government financing and support of the program.

CARE develops its programs exclusively with the State Governments which in addition to providing local resources also provide funds to meet the VolAgency local administrative costs. All projects are in support of programs requested by the GOI and the various State Governments.

CARE imports Title II commodities through six Indian ports. The State Governments dispatch commodities directly from the ports to inland consignees moving through a series of intermediate storage points at district, block and center level.

The Central Government provides final approval to all State CARE proposals and provides overall guidance on program directions. However, CARE retains full responsibility and control of commodities to the points of consumption by the beneficiaries.

b. Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

CRS operates through the Indian Catholic Church hierarchy and various private and quasi-government agencies. The VolAg administers its programs through six zonal offices and New Delhi headquarters with 10 Americans and 145 Indian staff members. Program activities include: feeding pre-school and school children, nursing and lactating women, food-for-work schemes, and some institutional feeding. CRS also has several agreements with the State Governments for specific school feeding programs which are carried out in conjunction with the State Municipal Corporations (city governments).

CRS Title II commodities arrive in India through five (5) major Indian ports. The distribution system functions through a network of 186 consignees through whom foods are channelled to approximately 7,000 distributors operating programs in various categories. Under the

Indo-U.S. Agreement, the GOI provides duty free entry, storage and transportation to the consignee's godowns. At the district level, cooperation and technical assistance is often made available by local government officials and departments. In some cases the local government provides funds for administration and supervision.

c. Church World Service/Lutheran World Relief (CWS/LWR)

CWS/LWR administers its Title II operation under the Indo-U.S. Agreement in 12 Indian States through its three zonal administrative offices in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras and from the New Delhi headquarters office. The programs are administered through the VolAg's counterpart organization C.A.S.A. (Church's Auxiliary for Social Action) which is the development arm of the National Christian Council of India. C.A.S.A. supports programs of emergency reaction activities, nutrition development, community development, agricultural development and urban slum removal, as well as social action and community organization. CWS/LWR Title II commodities are channelled through and programmed by this counterpart Agency whose Title II program activities are presently limited to maternal child health and food-for-work.

While CASA programs are not carried out directly through the government at any level, the Agency does maintain close contacts at the State and local levels. All projects operate with the non-objection of local government officials, particularly at the block and district levels. Frequently, local government officials provide expertise in the technical planning of projects such as field bunding, percolation and irrigation tanks, irrigation canals, etc. Such projects are checked at the local level for consistency with overall block development plans.

d. Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA)

CLUSA's Title II program is limited to the importation of vegetable oil to provide a source of funding assistance in developing India's cooperative vegoil sector. The program is unique in that the commodity will be sold to generate the financial inputs required to develop an integrated production and marketing system owned and controlled by members of village-level farmer cooperatives.

CLUSA and USAID will monitor the oil handling and sale, the operation of the Special Account into which all sales proceeds will be deposited, and the project activities supported by Title II resources.

With a staff of 2 Americans and 12 Indians, CLUSA will administer the program in cooperation with its counterpart agency, the Oilseed and Vegetable Oil Wing of the National Dairy Development Board (OVOW/NDDB), and will also coordinate closely with the Indian Dairy Corporation (IDC) who will handle port formalities and clearance and provide the logistical support for movement of the commodity to inland distributions. The arriving vegetable oil shipments are presently programmed for delivery at Kandla Port and Bhavnagar in 55-gallon drums. Bulk deliveries are being considered as a cost savings feature of the program and will be initiated ASAP if found to be viable.

11. In-Country Storage

The VolAgs have included specific statements in their FY 82 Operational Plans that in-country storage facilities are adequate. From our own monitoring activities we concur with

the VolAgs assessment. We note, however, that problems with Port congestion and inefficiency, especially Calcutta, are areas which require continuous monitoring.

12. Disincentive Effect

The PL 480 program proposed is small compared to indigenous foodgrain production (.5%). Further the program focuses on recipients in rural food deficit areas or in urban slums. The modest size and dispersion of the program as compared to the food requirements of India precludes it from having a disincentive effect.

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE XI
Country: INDIA
P.L. 480 TITLE I/III REQUIREMENTS
(Dollars in Millions, Tonnage in Thousands)

COMMODITIES	FY 1980			Estimated FY 1981			Projected FY 1982		
	Agreement		Shipments	Agreement		Shipments	Agreement		Shipments
	\$	MT		\$	MT		\$	MT	
<u>Title I</u>									
Vegetable Oil	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.0	50	40.0
Total							40.0	50	40.0
<u>Of which</u>									
<u>Title III</u>							-	-	-
Total									

COMMENT: The last Title I sales agreement was for 60,000 MT of Vegetable Oil in FY 1978 (\$27.8 million). The GOI has requested that a Title I program for Vegetable Oil be resumed in view of the continued increase in vegetable oil imports and India's deteriorating balance of payments situation and prospects.

FY 1982 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE XII

COUNTRY: INDIA

PL-480 TITLE ISupply and Distribution
(000 Metric Ton)STOCK SITUATION

	<u>FY 1980^{1/}</u>	<u>Estimated FY 1981</u>
<u>Commodity - Vegetable Oil</u>		
Beginning Stocks	Neg.	Neg.
Production	2,768	2,825
Imports	1,238	1,335
Concessional	80	60
Non-Concessional	1,158	1,255
Consumption	3,986	4,140
Ending Stocks	Neg.	Neg.

Comments: (1) Concessional vegetable oil imports include 60,000 MT per year under Title II (CLUSA and Volags). Canada is considering the donation of 20,000 MT in FY 80 for the Oilseeds Cooperative project.

(2) Our present estimate is that the situation in FY 82 will be similar to the situation in FY 1981, i.e., an increase in consumption of roughly 150,000 MT, a production increase of 50,000 MT, and a rise in imports on the order of 100,000 MT.

1/ Oilseeds marketing year (October - September) corresponds to U.S. fiscal year.

TABLE XIII

SUMMARYUSAID RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 1982 TITLE II PROGRAM

<u>VolAg</u>	<u>Maternal & Child Health (MCH)</u>	<u>School Feeding (SF)</u>	<u>Other Child Feeding (OCF)</u>	<u>Food for Work (FFW)</u>	<u>Individual Health Cases (IHC)</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Total</u>
I. <u>RECIPIENTS (No. of Beneficiaries in 000)</u>							
CARE	5,499	9,000	-	-	-	-	14,499
CRS	630	485	118	600	98	-	1,931
CWS/LWR	40	-	-	110	-	-	150
CLUSA	N.A	N.A	N.A.	N.A	N.A	N.A	N.A
Total:	<u>6,169</u>	<u>9,485</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>16,580</u>

II. COMMODITIES (in MTs)

CARE	118,904	131,506	-	-	-	-	250,410
CRS	34,020	15,054	9,204	89,400	7,644	-	155,322
CWS/LWR	1,535	-	-	19,568	-	-	21,103
CLUSA	-	-	-	-	-	27,500	27,500
Total:	<u>154,459</u>	<u>146,560</u>	<u>9,204</u>	<u>108,968</u>	<u>7,644</u>	<u>27,500</u>	<u>454,335</u>

III. DOLLAR FUNDING (in \$000) ^{1/}

CARE	41,365	44,210	-	-	-	-	85,575
CRS	13,283	5,388	3,221	25,120	2,676	-	49,688
CWS/LWR	563	-	-	4,021	-	-	4,584
CLUSA	-	-	-	-	-	22,743	22,743
Total:	<u>\$55,211</u>	<u>\$49,598</u>	<u>\$3,221</u>	<u>\$29,141</u>	<u>\$2,676</u>	<u>\$22,743</u>	<u>\$162,590</u>

1/ Excludes Ocean Freight.

TABLE XIII

PL 480 TITLE II - FY 1982

Country: India

Sponsor's Name: Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE)

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH..... Total Recipients: 5,499,000

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
1,269,000	CSM	26,481	10,804
3,844,000	B. WHEAT	77,792	20,148
506,000	W. FLOUR	7,432	2,014
473,000	NFDM	3,829	1,604
5,261,000	OIL	9,720	9,671
	TOTAL MCH:	<u>125,254</u>	<u>\$44,241</u>

B. SCHOOL FEEDING..... Total Recipients: 10, 592, 000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGs	Dollars
545,000	CSM	6,084	2,482
9,697,000	B. WHEAT	132,669	34,361
250,000	W. FLOUR	2,475	671
250,000	NFDM	225	94
10,592,000	OIL	14,471	14,399
	TOTAL SF:	155,924	\$52,007

C. FOOD FOR WORK.....Total Recipients: NIL

D. TOTAL PROPOSED BY CARE: Recipients: 16,091,000
Commodities: 281,178 MT
Cost: \$ 96,248,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED BY USAID: Recipients: 14,499,000
Commodities: 250,000 MT
Cost: \$ 85,575,000

TABLE XIIIPL 480 TITLE II - FY 1982

Country: India

Sponsor's Name: Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH..... Total Recipients: 700,000

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
700,000	CSM	12,600	5,141
700,000	BULGUR	21,000	5,439
700,000	OIL	4,200	4,179

TOTAL MCH: 37,800 \$14,759

B. SCHOOL FEEDING..... Total Recipients: 575,000

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs.</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
385,000	CSM	5,198	2,121
485,000	BULGUR	11,115	2,878
575,000	OIL	1,414	1,408
90,000	FLOUR	927	251

TOTAL SF: 18,654 \$6,658

C. FOOD FOR WORK..... Total Recipients: 650,000

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs.</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
650,000	BULGUR	93,600	24,242
650,000	OIL	6,500	5,922

TOTAL FFW: 100,100 \$30,164

TABLE XIIICRS (CONTINUED)

D. OTHER CHILD FEEDING..... Total Recipients: 130, 000

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
130, 000	CSM	2, 340	955
130, 000	BULGUR	7, 020	1. 818
130, 000	OIL	780	776

TOTAL OCF:	<u>10,140</u>	<u>\$ 3,549</u>
------------	---------------	-----------------

E. INDIVIDUAL HEALTH CASES..... Total Recipients: 125, 000

<u>No. of Recipients. by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
125, 000	CSM	2, 250	918
125, 000	BULGUR	6, 750	1, 748
125, 000	OIL	750	746

TOTAL IHC	<u>9,750</u>	<u>\$ 3,412</u>
-----------	--------------	-----------------

F. TOTAL PROPOSED BY CRS:

Recipients:	2,180, 000
Commodities:	176,444 MT
Cost:	\$ 58,542,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED BY USAID:

Recipients:	1,931, 000
Commodities:	155,322 MT
Cost:	\$ 49,688,000

TABLE XIIIPL 480 TITLE II - FY 1982

Country: India

Sponsor's Name: Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA)

A. OTHER..... Total Recipients: N.A

<u>No. of Recipients by Commodity</u>	<u>Name of Commodity</u>	(Thousands)	
		<u>KGs.</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
N.A.	VEG. OIL	27, 500	22, 743
	TOTAL OTHER:	<u>27, 500</u>	<u>\$22, 743</u>

B. TOTAL PROPOSED BY CLUSA: Recipients: N.A
 Commodities: 27, 500 MT
 Cost: \$ 22, 743

TOTAL RECOMMENDED BY USAID: Recipients: N.A
 Commodities: 27, 500 MT
 Cost: \$ 22, 743

Annex I

PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition
- Titles I, II and III -

ALL TITLES							PL 480 TITLE II ONLY		
Table V Rank	Table XI Intra Rank	Title (I, II, III)	Proposed Funding (\$000)	Commodity	Units MT, Bales, MTGE KGs)	Amount (000)	Identify Sponsor	Type: MCH, School Feeding, FFW, Other	Estimated Number Of Recipients (000)
4	1	Title II	4,372 4,098 9,112 975 554 <u>19,111</u>	CSM Oil Bulgar W. Flour NFDm	Kgs.	10,716 4,119 35,180 3,597 1,322	CARE	MCH	2,540
5	2	"	4,627 4,895 3,761 <u>13,283</u>	CSM Bulgar Oil	"	11,340 18,900 3,780	CRS	MCH	630
5	3	"	204 134 <u>338</u>	Bulgar Oil	"	786 135	CWS	MCH	24
5	4	"	136 89 <u>225</u>	Bulgar Oil	"	524 90	LWR	MCH	16

PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition
- Titles I, II and III -

Annex I

96

Table V Rank	Table XI Intra Rank	Title (I, II, III)	ALL TITLES				PL 480 TITLE II ONLY		
			Proposed Funding (\$000)	Commodity	Units MT, Bales, MTGE KGs)	Amount (000)	Identify Sponsor	Type: MCH, School Feeding, FFW, Other	Estimated Number Of Recipients (000)
6	5	Title II	3,369 3,158 7,021 751 427 <u>14,726</u>	CSM Oil Bulgur W. Flour NFDM	Kgs.	8,257 3,174 27,108 2,772 1,019	CARE	MCH	1,956
9	6	"	22,743 <u>22,743</u>	Oil	"	27,500	CLUSA	Ag. Oilseeds Cooperative Development	N. A
10	7	"	2,692 57 28,725 396 12,340 <u>44,210</u>	CSM NFDM Bulgur W. Flour Oil	"	6,599 135 110,908 1,462 12,402	CARE	SF	9,000
11	8	"	1,674 816 2,126 <u>4,616</u>	CSM Oil Bulgur	"	4,104 820 8,208	CRS	SF	304
12	9	"	22,378 2,742 <u>25,120</u>	Bulgur Oil	"	86,400 3,000	CRS	FFW	600

Annex I

PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition
- Titles I, II and III -

Table V Rank	Table XI Intra Rank	Title (I, II, III)	ALL TITLES			PL 480 TITLE II ONLY			
			Proposed Funding (\$000)	Commodity	Units MT, Bales, MTGE KGs)	Amount (000)	Identify Sponsor	Type: MCH, School Feeding, FFW, Other	Estimated Number Of Recipients (000)
12	10	Title II	1,104 326 986 <u>2,416</u>	Bulgar Oil Corn	Kgs.	4,265 328 7,147	CWS	FFW	66
12	11	"	730 218 657 <u>1,605</u>	Bulgar Oil Corn	"	2,844 219 4,765	LWR	FFW	44
18	12	"	1,722 1,615 3,589 384 218 <u>7,528</u>	CSM Oil Bulgar W. Flour NFDm	"	4,221 1,623 13,859 1,417 520	CARE	MCH	1 003
19	13	"	356 237 179 <u>772</u>	Oil W. Flour Bulgar	"	358 873 691	CRS	SF	181
20	14	"	867 1,650 704 <u>3,221</u>	CSM Bulgar Oil	"	2,124 6,372 708	CRS	Other Child Feeding	118

PL 480 Program Ranking and Composition
- Titles I, II and III -

Annex I

10

ALL TITLES							PL 480 TITLE II ONLY		
Table V Rank	Table XI Intra Rank	Title (I, II, III)	Proposed Funding (\$000)	Commodity	Units MT, Bales, MTGE KGs)	Amount (000)	Identify Sponsor	Type: MCH, School Feeding, FFW, Other	Estimated Number Of Recipients (000)
21	15	Title II	720 1,371 585 <u>2,676</u>	CSM Bulgur Oil	Kgs.	1,764 5,292 588	CRS	Individual Health Cases	98
27	16	Title I	<u>40,000</u>	Oil	MTs	50			

INDIA: FY 1982 ABS

STATUS OF SFCA's FOR NEPALESE TRAINING
IN INDIA AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1979

	\$	Rs. Equiv.	Rate of ^{a/} Conversions
FY 1976 & T. Q. SFCA Transfers :	200, 000	1, 842, 000	@ Rs. 9. 21
Less: FY 76/TQ Obligations (net) :	128, 115	1, 179, 939	@ Rs. 9. 21
	71, 885	662, 061	
Add: FY 1977 SFCA Transfers :	400, 000	3, 552, 000	@ Rs. 8. 88
	471, 885	4, 214, 061	
Less: FY 1977 Obligations (net) :	355, 615	3, 157, 865	@ Rs. 8. 88
	116, 270	1, 056, 196	
Add: FY 1978 SFCA Transfers :	400, 000	3, 464, 000	@ Rs. 8. 66
	516, 270	4, 520, 196	
Less: FY 1978 Obligations (net) :	377, 309	3, 267, 497	@ Rs. 8. 66
Unobligated Balance as of September 30, 1978	138, 961	1, 252, 699	
Add: FY 1979 SFCA Transfers :	400, 000	3, 292, 000	@ Rs. 8. 23
	538, 961	4, 544, 699	
Less: FY 1979 Obligations :	352, 066	2, 897, 500	@ Rs. 8. 23
Unliquidated Balance as of September 30, 1979	186, 895 ^{b/}	1, 647, 199 ^{b/}	
FY 1980 SFCA Transfers (as of May 31, 1980)	400, 000 ^{c/}	3, 244, 400 ^{c/}	@ Rs. 8. 111

^{a/} Treasury transfers to AID were effected at these exchange rates.

^{b/} 'Carryover authority' to use these unobligated balances in FY 1980 not provided in the proposed FY 1980 Appropriation Act, therefore these balances remain unavailable for obligation and may be deallotted.

^{c/} Represents allocation under CR against CP request of \$500, 000. Revised FY 1980 obligational requirements are estimated to exceed the CP level. Program reductions will be necessary if remaining \$100, 000 in the SFCA are not allocated.

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING IN INDIANEPALESE PARTICIPANTS - FY 1980

<u>Field of Training</u>			<u>Estimated Cost</u>	
			<u>Indian Rupees</u>	<u>*\$Equiv.</u>
NEW PARTICIPANTS				
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's)	No.	Duration		
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's)	25	4 years	425,000	52,398
B.Sc. Agr. (Fresh)	20	4 years	340,000	41,918
B.Sc. Agr. Engg. (Fresh)	4	5 years	68,000	8,384
M.Sc. Agr.	13	2 years	247,000	30,452
Ph.D. Agronomy	1	3 years	19,000	2,342
Education, M.Ed. Course	2	1 year	43,700	5,388
Forestry, Diploma	2	2 years	38,000	4,685
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)	2	2 years	26,000	3,206
Public Health Nursing, Diploma	4	1 year	52,000	6,411
Health Education, Diploma	2	1 year	43,700	5,388
Obstetrics & Gynecology, Diploma	4	1 year	95,000	11,712
M. P. H.	1	1 year	21,850	2,694
Program Management	1	2 years	19,000	2,342
M.Sc. Financial Management	1	1 year	19,000	2,342
Animal Breeding	1	9 months	19,000	2,342
Statistical/Health Education	2	3 months	34,200	4,216
Soil Conservation	4	6 months	66,500	8,199
Personnel Management	1	3 months	9,500	1,172
Business Auditing	1	3 months	9,500	1,172
Storage Construction	1	3 months	9,500	1,172
Marketing Agr. Inputs	1	3 months	9,500	1,172
Program Budgeting	1	6 months	17,100	2,108
Computer Training	4	3 months	58,900	7,262
Radio Education Technology	3	3 months	28,500	3,514
Malariology Course	16	2 months	133,600	16,471
Vehicle Maintenance (Malaria)	2	6 months	33,250	4,099
Advanced Entomology	2	3 months	22,000	2,712
Geological and Construction Engg.	10	1 month	65,000	8,014
Rural Development Management	5	6 months	85,500	10,541
Construction and Maintenance of	5	6 months	85,500	10,541
Small Scale Rural Irrigation and				
Drinking Water System				
Sub-Total:	141		2,144,300	264,369

(83LT/58ST)

CONTINUING

B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 76)	17		a/
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 77)	24	384,000	47,343
B.Sc. Agr. (Fresh, FY 77)	25	152,000	b/ 18,740
B.Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 78)	24	384,000	47,343

Contd.

<u>Field of Training</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	
			<u>Indian Rupees</u>	<u>*\$Equiv.</u>
<u>CONTINUING</u>				
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 78)	25		400,000	49,316
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 79)	25		400,000	49,316
B.Sc. Agr, Agr. Engg and Fisheries (Fresh, FY 79)	22		352,000	43,398
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 77)	3		24,000	c/ 2,959
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 77)	2			a/
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 78)	5			a/
Ph. D. Agronomy (FY 78)	1		20,000	2,466
Ph. D. Statistics (FY 78)	1			a/
Ph. D. Agr. Economics (FY 79)	1		32,000	3,945
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 79)	8		152,000	d/ 18,740
Ph. D. Agr. Chemistry (FY 79)	1		-	e/
Ph. D. Plant Breeding (FY 79)	1		-	e/
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic) (FY 78)	2		-	a/
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic) (FY 79)	2		-	a/
Public Health Nursing, Diploma (FY 79)	2		-	a/
Health Education, Diploma (FY 79)	3		-	a/
Forestry, Diploma (FY 79)	5		-	a/
Fruit Nursery Management (FY 78)	1		-	a/
Soil Conservation (FY 79)	5		-	a/
Rice Production (FY 79)	1		-	a/
Poultry Sexing (FY 78)	1		-	a/
Sub-Total:	<u>207</u>		<u>2,300,000</u>	<u>283,566</u>
Total:	<u>348</u>		<u>4,444,300</u>	<u>\$ 547,935</u>

Footnotes

*@ Rs. 8.111 to US\$1.00

ST = Short Term (Less than 9 months)

LT = Long Term (9 months or more)

a/ Fully funded in prior year.

b/ Additional funding for one trimester through completion.

c/ Additional funding covers short-fall in prior year's PIO/Ps, due to extension in program.

d/ Funding covers through program completion.

e/ Participants to start their program in July 1980.

Note: Actual program will be limited to SFCA availabilities for FY 80. Currently \$400,000 is allotted under the Continuing Resolution. An appropriations request for \$500,000 excess rupees equivalent in the FY 1980 Congressional Presentation is pending in the U.S. Congress.

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING IN INDIANEPALESE PARTICIPANTS- FY 1981

<u>Field of Training</u>			<u>Estimated Cost</u>	
			<u>Indian Rupees</u>	<u>*\$ Equiv.</u>
<u>NEW PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Duration</u>		
B.Sc. Civil Engg.	2	4 years	36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's)	25	4 years	425,000	53,125
B.Sc. Agr. Engg. (Fresh)	2	4 years	36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Agr. (Fresh)	26	3-4 years	442,000	55,250
B.Sc. Sanitation Engg.	2	4 years	36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Livestock Production	1	4 years	17,000	2,125
M.Sc. Agr.	15	2 years	300,000	37,500
Forestry, Diploma	8	2 years	160,000	20,000
Education, M. Ed.	2	1 year	46,000	5,750
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)	2	2 years	27,000	3,375
Public Health Nursing, Diploma	4	1 year	55,000	6,875
Health Ed., Diploma	2	1 year	46,000	5,750
Public Health, Diploma (M.P.H)	1	2 years	23,000	2,875
Obstetrics & Gynecology, Diploma	2	1 year	50,000	6,250
Financial Management, M.Sc.	2	1 year	40,000	5,000
Agriculture Sciences	8	3 months	77,000	9,625
Seed Training	4	3 months	38,500	4,812
Soil Conservation	5	6 months	87,000	10,875
Project Planning	1	6 months	18,000	2,250
Marketing Management	2	3 months	20,000	2,500
Marine Insurance	1	3 months	10,000	1,250
Financial Analysis	1	3 months	10,000	1,250
Statistical Evaluation	1	3 months	10,000	1,250
Forestry	7	6 months	122,000	15,250
Livestock Development and Animal Health	1	3-6 months	18,000	2,250
Medium Irrigation	1	3-6 months	18,000	2,250
Renewable Resources Management	1	3-6 months	18,000	2,250
Rural Education	1	3-6 months	18,000	2,250
Rural Industry Development	3	3-6 months	54,000	6,750
Geological & Construction	5	1 month	34,000	4,250
Engineering				
Mechanics (Light Duty)	3	6 months	69,000	8,625
Mechanics (Heavy Duty)	3	6 months	69,000	8,625
Auto Electricians	3	6 months	69,000	8,625
Basic Malariology Course	16	2 months	140,000	17,500
Vehicle Maintenance	2	3 months	35,000	4,375
Sub-Total	<u>165</u>		<u>2,673,500</u>	<u>334,187</u>
(96LT/69ST)				

CONTINUING

B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 1976)	17	-	a/	
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 77)	24	408,000	b/	51,000

Contd.

Field of Training	No.	Duration	Estimated Cost	
			Indian Rupees	*\$Equiv.
CONTINUING				
M. Sc. Agr. (FY 77)	1		-	a/ -
M. Sc. Agr. (FY 78)	1		-	a/ -
Ph. D. Agronomy (FY 78)	1		20,000	2,500
Ph. D. Statistics (FY 78)	1		-	a/ -
B. Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 78)	24		408,000	51,000
B. Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 78)	25		425,000	53,125
B. Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 79)	25		425,000	53,125
B. Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 79)	22		374,000	46,750
Forestry, Diploma (FY 79)	5		-	a/ -
B. Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)(FY79)	2		-	a/ -
M. Sc. Agr. (FY 79)	8		-	-
Ph. D. Agr. Chemistry (FY 79)	1		20,000	b/ 2,500
Ph. D. Plant Breeding (FY 79)	1		20,000	b/ 2,500
Ph. D. Agr. Economics (FY 79)	1		8,000	c/ 1,000
B. Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 80)	25		425,000	53.125
B. Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg.(Fresh, FY 80)	24		408,000	51,000
M. Sc. Agr. (FY 80)	13		247,000	b/ 30,875
Ph. D. Agr. (FY 80)	1		38,000	d/ 4,750
Forestry, Diploma (FY 80)	2		38,000	b/ 4,750
Education, M. Ed. Course (FY 80)	2		-	a/ -
B. Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)(FY 80)	2		26,000	b/ 3,250
Public Health Nursing, Diploma (FY 80)	4		-	a/ -
Health Education, Diploma(FY 80)	2		-	a/ -
Obstetrics & Gynecology, Diploma (FY 80)	4		-	a/ -
M. P. H. (FY 80)	1		-	a/ -
Program Management (FY 80)	1		19,000	b/ 2,375
M. Sc. Financial Management(FY80)	1		-	a/ -
Soil Conservation	4		-	a/ -
Financial Budget	1		-	a/ -
Vehicle Maintenance(Malaria)	2		-	a/ -
Rural Development Management	5		-	a/ -
Construction and Maintenance of Small Scale Rural Irrigation & Drinking Water Systems	5		-	a/ -
Sub- Total:	<u>258</u>		<u>3,309,000</u>	<u>413,625</u>
Total:	<u>423</u>		<u>5,982,500</u>	<u>\$ 747,812</u>

Footnotes

*@Rs. 8 to US\$1.00

LT = Long Term (9 months or more)

ST = Short Term (Less than 9 months)

- a/ Fully funded in prior year.
- b/ Funding covers through program completion.
- c/ Funding covers shortfall in prior year's PIO/Ps.
- d/ Funding covers 2nd and 3rd year for one Ph. D. student through program completion.

Note: The FY 1981 Congressional Presentation requests \$650,000 excess rupees equivalent for this program. If the GOI concurs with the higher level proposed by the Royal Nepal Government and USAID/Nepal, and sufficient candidates are located, a supplemental appropriation request would be required.

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING IN INDIA

NEPALESE PARTICIPANTS - FY 1982

85

Field of Training			Estimated Cost	
NEW PARTICIPANTS	No.	Duration	Indian Rupees	*\$Equiv.
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's)	29	4 years	522,000	65,250
B.Sc. Agr. (Fresh)	30	4 years	540,000	67,500
B.Sc. Sanitation Engg.	2	5 years	38,000	4,750
B.Sc. Civil Engg.	2	5 years	38,000	4,750
B.Sc. Livestock Production	2	4 years	36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Engg. (Soil)	1	5 years	19,000	2,375
B.Sc. /B. A. Rural Development	2	3 years	36,000	4,500
M. A. /M. Sc. Inst. Dev. Mgt.	1	2 years	21,000	2,625
M. Sc. Hydrology	2	2 years	42,000	5,250
M. Sc. Agr.	20	2 years	420,000	52,500
M. Sc. Meteorology	2	2 years	42,000	5,250
Forestry, Diploma	9	2 years	189,000	23,625
M. Sc. Management	1	2 years	21,000	2,625
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)	2	2 years	29,000	3,625
Public Health Nursing, Diploma	4	1 year	57,000	7,125
Health Education, Diploma	2	1 year	48,000	6,000
Financial Management (M. Sc.)	2	1 year	42,000	5,250
Education, M. Ed. Course	2	1 year	48,000	6,000
Program Management (Pb. Adm)	2	2 years	42,000	5,250
Soil Conservation	4	6 months	72,000	9,000
Agriculture Sciences	8	3 months	81,000	10,125
Seed Training	4	3 months	40,000	5,000
Project Planning	1	6 months	19,000	2,375
Marketing Management	2	3 months	21,000	2,625
Marine Insurance	1	3 months	10,000	1,250
Financial Analysis	1	3 months	10,000	1,250
Forestry	9	6 months	204,000	25,500
Geological & Construction Engg.	5	1 month	36,000	4,500
Mechanics (Light Duty)	3	6 months	72,000	9,000
Mechanics (Heavy Duty)	3	6 months	72,000	9,000
Agr. Extn. & Training	1	6 months	19,000	2,375
Livestock Development and	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Animal Health				
Medium Irrigation	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Renewable Resource	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Management				
Rural Industry Development	3	3-6 months	57,000	7,125
Rural Education	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Institutional Development	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Management & Planning	1	3-6 months	19,000	2,375
Auto Electrician	3	6 months	72,000	9,000
Course in Malariology	10	2 months	92,000	11,500
Logistics Training	2	3 months	37,000	4,625
Vehicles Maintenance	2	3 months	37,000	4,625
Sub-Total:	185		3,295,000	411,875

(117 LT/68 ST)

Contd.

<u>Field of Training</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>	
			<u>Indian Rupees</u>	<u>*\$Equiv.</u>
<u>CONTINUING</u>				
B.Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 78)	24		162,000	a/ 20,250
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 78)	25		142,500	b/ 17,812
Ph. D. Agronomy (FY 78)	1		-	c/
Ph. D. Statistics (FY 78)	1		-	c/
B.Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 79)	22		374,000	46,750
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 79)	25		425,000	d/ 53,125
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 79)	1		-	c/
Ph. D. Agr. Chemistry (FY 79)	1		-	c/
Ph. D. Plant Breeding (FY 79)	1		-	c/
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 80)	25		425,000	53,125
B.Sc. Agr. & Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 80)	24		408,000	51,000
M.Sc. /Ph. D. Agr. (FY 80)	14		-	c/
Forestry, Diploma (FY 80)	2		-	c/
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)(FY80)	2		-	c/
Program Management (FY 80)	1		-	c/
B.Sc. Civil Engg. (FY 81)	2		36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Agr. (JTA's, FY 81)	25		425,000	53,125
B.Sc. Agr. Engg. (Fresh, FY 81)	2		36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Agr. (Fresh, FY 81)	26		442,000	55,250
B.Sc. Sanitation Engg. (FY 81)	2		36,000	4,500
B.Sc. Livestock Production (FY 81)	1		17,000	2,125
M.Sc. Agr. (FY 81)	15		300,000	d/ 37,500
Forestry, Diploma (FY 81)	8		160,000	d/ 20,000
B.Sc. Nursing (Post Basic)(FY81)	2		27,000	d/ 3,375
Public Health, Diploma (M. P. H.) (FY 81)	1		23,000	d/ 2,875
Education, M. Ed. (FY 81)	2		-	c/
Public Health Nursing, Diploma (FY 81)	4		-	c/
Health Ed., Diploma (FY 81)	2		-	c/
Obstetrics & Gynecology, Diploma (FY 81)	2		-	c/
Financial Management, M. Sc. (FY 81)	2		-	c/
Soil Conservation (FY 81)	5		-	c/
Project Planning (FY 81)	1		-	c/
Mechanics (Light Duty) (FY 81)	3		-	c/
Mechanics (Heavy Duty) (FY 81)	3		-	c/
Auto Electrician (FY 81)	3		-	c/
Sub-Total:	<u>280</u>		<u>3,438,500</u>	<u>429,812</u>
Total:	<u>465</u>		<u>6,733,500</u>	<u>\$841,687</u>
				or \$840,000

Footnotes.

*@Rs. 8 to US\$1.00

LT=Long Term (9 months or more)

ST=Short Term (Less than 9 months)

- a/ Funding covers for nine Agr. Engg. students for fifth year, through program completion. No incremental funding required for remaining students.
- b/ Funding covers for one trimester through program completion.
- c/ Fully funded in prior year.
- d/ Funding covers through program completion.

Note: FY 82 estimated cost includes one-year initial funding for new (107) long-term participants and one-year incremental funding for continuing (129) long-term participants. If we were to fully fund these participants for total duration of their training program, as per ABS guidelines, it would cost an additional \$1.1 million to a total of \$1.9 million. However, USAID/Nepal's request for 185 new starts may not be approved by GOI and the actual program may reach the level of FY 1981 request (165 new starts). USAID/New Delhi in consultation with USAID/Nepal will advise AID/W prior to CP submission date, of final FY 1982 requirements based on decision on new starts and full funding or incremental funding.